

AMERICA

A·CATHOLIC·REVIEW·OF·THE·WEEK

VOL. XXII. No. 25 }
WHOLE No. 551 }

April 10, 1920

{ PRICE, 10 CENTS
\$4.00 A YEAR }

Chronicle

The Peace Conference.—The note which Mr. Wilson recently sent to the French Government in reply to that country's request for an expression of the views of the

The Turkish Problem

United States on the tentative decisions reached by the Allies on the situation in Turkey has not introduced order into the confusion which still surrounds the matter. The President does not think it advisable under the present conditions to send a plenipotentiary to the conference, but, in view of the fact that the American people are vitally interested in the proposed solution, he declares that he feels it wise to state this opinion of the problems connected with the Turkish question.

The Government of the United States understands the strength of the arguments for the retention of the Turks at Constantinople, but believes that the arguments against it are far stronger and contain certain imperative elements which it would not seem possible to ignore. It was the often-expressed intention of the Allies that the anomaly of the Turks in Europe should cease, and it cannot be believed that the feelings of the Mohammedan peoples, who not only witnessed the defeat of Turkish power without protest, but even materially assisted in the defeat, will now so resent the expulsion of the Turkish Government as to make a complete reversal of policy on the part of the great powers desirable or necessary.

How far this position is at variance with that of the Allies is clear from the statement made by Lloyd George, on March 25, when replying to the criticism of the Government's foreign policy by Mr. Asquith. The Premier declared that the proposal to drive the Turk from Constantinople had been rejected, because it left the question of the future government of that city undecided, and also because the Allies were unwilling to assume the responsibility and expense of its administration. The refusal of the United States, he said, to accept a mandate over the city had complicated matters, but the Allies had requested America to express its views on the situation for fear of seeming to be making capital out of the political strife.

Unofficial reports declare that France regards Mr. Wilson's ideas as impracticable so long as America refuses to accept any share in keeping the Turk in order and in protecting Armenia, and since the refusal of the Senate to ratify the treaty American idealism has no longer so strong a case in Paris. If the United States were willing to back up Mr. Wilson's views by assuming a mandate over Turkey the Allies would perhaps be not unwilling to accept the plan. Turkey has been shocked by the insist-

ence of the President on the expulsion of its people from Europe, and Greece resents his suggestion that Adrianople be handed over to Bulgaria.

Aside from official opinion, there has been a good deal of sympathy manifested for the position championed by the President, although it anticipated his expression of views; and the reversal of policy by the Allies has been characterized as a breach of faith with the world, which had been led to believe that one of the fruits of the war would be the expulsion of the Turk from Europe, also, that the long domination by the Moslem over Christian communities would be ended. The unconditional surrender of the Turk, with the consequent fact that the disposition of Turkish territory rested with the Allies, gave color to this hope, which was further emphasized by issuance on the part of the Supreme Council of provisional mandates over portions of the Ottoman Empire. The matter will be taken up at the conference of the Supreme Council, which is to begin sittings at San Remo on April 19. That the position of the United States on the subject has not been finally adopted is clear from the fact that on April 3 President Wilson submitted to the Senate the report of the Harbord mission, which has been investigating Near Eastern conditions. This report gives the reasons for and against the acceptance by the United States of a mandate.

Home News.—On April 1 the House Foreign Affairs Committee voted favorably on the resolution introduced by Representative Porter into the House on March 31,

Resolution to with a few minor modifications.
End War The vote stood twelve to six, and followed partisan lines.

The resolution was reported in the House on April 6, the anniversary of the declaration of war, and had the right of way on April 8. The joint resolution declared the war to be at an end, although it did not declare peace to exist between Germany and the United States. The effect desired is to terminate all war-time legislation and organizations, such as the Shipping Board and the War Risk Insurance Bureau; the Lever Food and Fuel Control act, with clauses against profiteering; the espionage law; authorization for loans to the Allies; control over shipping; authority for priority shipments; Employment Bureau of the Department of Labor; authority for an embargo on imports; the War Finance Corporation; Capital Issues Committee; Trading with the Enemy act.

and the Overman act, empowering the President to distribute executive powers.

France.—In the preamble of the bill brought before the Chamber for the resumption of diplomatic relations with the Holy See, already referred to in AMERICA

Diplomatic Relations with the Vatican for March 20, the grounds are stated on which such policy is founded.

Among the reasons given are the following: French diplomacy must have its official share in the discussion at the Vatican of those questions in which French interests are involved; it cannot any longer remain absent from the seat of that spiritual Government at which the greater number of States are careful to be represented; the enforcement of the various peace treaties which are putting an end to the World War, makes the resumption of these relations with the Holy See particularly timely. Other reasons are these:

In France itself, the Peace Treaty of Versailles raises problems that must be solved, such as the application of the old Concordat in Alsace-Lorraine, and the fate of the old German missions in the colonies in Togoland, the Cameroons and elsewhere. Finally, the exercise by our nationals of the Catholic religion in Morocco must be safeguarded as it has been in Tunis and our colonies.

The Radicals, Socialists and anti-Clericals of every description are strongly opposed to the measure. Against it, under the leadership of two of their most effective speakers, Boncour and Varenne, the Socialists have united the various sections of their party. The Radicals, on the other hand, do not seem so unanimous in their program of opposition. Two markedly anti-religious journals, *L'Ere Nouvelle* and *La Lanterne*, are bitterly attacking the Government for its policy.

"This mobilization" of the anti-clerical forces, says *La Croix*, is not causing much dismay in Catholic circles. Led by purely practical and political reasons, such men as Messrs. Briand and Viviani have been won over to the support of the bill. As far back as 1918, M. de Monzie, a pronounced Radical, argued in his book, "Rome Without Canossa," that France could no longer abstain from representation at the Vatican, without harm to her own interests. At the same time M. Viviani declared that France should no longer conduct her business with the Holy See "up the back stairs." Now, M. Joseph Donais, in the *Libre Parole* says quite openly that the resumption of the long-severed diplomatic relations with the Vatican will restore to France that international respect and influence which she has so long and so recklessly disdained. In the *Journal des Débats*, M. Auguste Gauvain says explicitly that France "must no longer sulk with one of the greatest moral forces of the world" for the country wants religious peace.

Writing in *L'Echo de Paris* on this question, in which Catholics and the true friends of France throughout the world are so deeply interested, Mgr. A. Baudrillart states that "the attitude of Catholics throughout the world towards France depends upon the attitude which France

herself will assume towards the Holy See. Her decision on this question will be the great test." Referring to his own work on the *Comité Catholique de Propagande Française à L'Etranger*, and to his personal experience in Spain and the United States during the war, this eminent French writer asserts with a frankness as remarkable as his keen insight into Catholic opinion, that to all his apologies of Catholic France, the one almost invariable answer was: "Let France renew her diplomatic relations with the Holy See, and we shall believe, as you affirm, that she is not the enemy of the Church and of religion, that she does not constitute in every country a danger spot for Catholicism."

This, adds the Rector of the Catholic Institute of Paris, is the argument, which without the intention of offending the just susceptibilities of French Catholics, the Catholics of Italy, of Spain and of the Spanish-American Republics have time and again brought forth. It is an argument, he adds, which he frequently heard while in the United States, and which he is constantly gathering from the acts and pronouncements of its Bishops, the declarations of the representatives of the Knights of Columbus, and from the Catholic Press. He has read it, he concludes, in the columns of AMERICA. All without exception have made him realize that the great test of the genuine Catholicism of his country lies in the decision she will take on this momentous question.

In a luminous article written for *La Croix*, "Franc" reviews the critical situation in which France finds itself in its relations with those very nations with which

France and Her Former Allies

it was so closely associated during the war. They were all then united with her under one supreme military command. But since the war, he regrets to say, it has been impossible to attain unity of diplomatic command. Hence national rivalries, antipathies and policies have become more and more pronounced, while Germany has used the opportunity thus offered and endeavored to breed discontent between the former members of the Entente. The writer in *La Croix* declares that one of the most serious crises his country has had to face in these last months, was caused by the United States. Not without some trace of disappointment he appeals in proof of his assertion to the opposition to the ratification by the American Senate of the Treaty of Versailles, and to the commercial policies of the American people, which, he affirms, without however giving any proofs of his assertions, has enabled it to amass "heaps of dollars," thus compromising the French rate of exchange and lowering French financial credit in view of its own "immediate gain." Yet, he adds France will ever remain deeply grateful to the United States for its generous help and intervention.

Still more critical, says the writer of *La Croix*, although less openly manifested is the tension that exists between France and Great Britain. At the time of the incident of Fashoda, when Marchant and Kitchener met

on what might have been bloodstained ground in the heart of Africa, a dangerous tension had already manifested itself between the two countries. Thanks to the skilful diplomacy of King Edward VII, it was relieved and a *rapprochement* effected, which culminated in the common efforts made by Great Britain and France standing together to ward off the German invasion. But, says France, a glance at the map will show that the interests of the two countries are quite different and at times diametrically opposed. In Syria and Palestine, for instance, France keeps her eyes steadily fixed on her age-long traditions and policies. England on the contrary keeps in view her policy of penetration into the heart of Asia, she is looking to the strengthening of her strategic position in Egypt, and to the natural resources of the country. Moreover while the British navy has always aimed, says the contributor to *La Croix*, at naval hegemony, the French navy has been greatly weakened and the British allies of France have not escaped the alluring temptation to profit by this inferiority and thus derive immense commercial and industrial benefit.

Germany.—Last week the Government reached the decision that it was necessary to dispatch troops to the Ruhr region. This step was to be taken as soon as the

Reichswehr in the Ruhr Region Entente consented. It had become inevitable, the statement declared, in view of the lawlessness that reigned

unchecked in the region about Essen, Dortmund, Duisburg and Mulheim, which was said to have assumed such proportions that the local authorities and labor leaders admitted they were no longer able to protect the civilian population. Terrorist bands, disavowed even by the Communists, were reported to be looting food trains. Control by the workmen ceased theoretically throughout the Ruhr district at noon, April 2, according to the peace terms ratified on the preceding night at Essen. The troops, whose presence was considered imperative, were to act merely in a police capacity under the authority of the Prussian Minister of the Interior, Severing. On that same day the Reichswehr marched against Duisburg, where looting and disorder were reported quite prevalent. According to the Central Committee, the action was taken at the request of the Independents and Social Democrats. Duisburg is described as a hotbed of radicalism, aliens and Spartacans. Various executive committees in the Ruhr district, on the other hand, including that of Essen, have issued proclamations asserting that the Reichswehr is violating the treaty terms by marching into these regions. At the same time the Reds were ordered by these same committees to lay down their arms and observe the peace terms. According to an account from the Hague, the advance of the Government has been successful along the entire line. The defense of the Red armies is said to have been inefficient. A Cologne despatch describes the Reds at Duisburg as fighting individually, firing from windows and house tops.

Artillery and machine-gun fire could also be heard. The leaders of the disorder, the Dutch account states, are mainly Germans, but a few only are professional officers. Though the Russian element is declared insignificant yet companies of the Red army have been named after prominent Russian and other extremists, bearing such names as Company Lenine, Company Trotzky, Company Karl Liebknecht.

The German occupation of the Ruhr region had not been authorized, but Dr. Goepfert, head of the German Peace Commission, informed the President of the Peace Conference that troops exceeding the number allowed by the decision of August 9, 1919, had entered the Ruhr basin. The original entry of the Reichswehr troops, without authorization, was said to have been due to an error and the troops, it was then stated, would be ordered to discontinue their march. Hence the complications that arose with the French authorities, since the troops continued their work of quelling the disturbances and restoring security in the Ruhr district.

On April 4 Premier Millerand notified the Allied and Associated Governments that French troops would occupy the German cities of Frankford, Darmstadt, Homburg, and Hanau, and their vicinity on the right bank of the Rhine in reprisal for the invasion of the Ruhr basin by German soldiers in violation of the Versailles Treaty.

Ireland.—On Wednesday, March 31, the Home Rule bill passed the second reading in the House of Commons by a vote of three hundred and forty-eight to ninety-four,

Home Rule a majority of two hundred and fifty-four. Parliament has now suspended leaving Ulster practically set up as a nation, but not a State, distinct from the rest of Ireland, and all the rest of Erin under martial law, bound to Britain, as the Premier admitted, by a grappling hook, not by "a union." The debate was of interest chiefly on account of the repudiation of the principles for which England declared she entered the World War and for attacks on the United States. Macpherson and Lloyd George sneered at self-determination and the Premier drew this interesting comparison which will amuse historians, although the Commons cheered it:

I want to put this to our American friends. De Valera is putting forward the same claim in exactly the same language as Jefferson Davis did. The ancestors of some of the men who voted for the motion in the Senate the other day fought to death against conceding to the Southern States of the United States of America the very demand their descendants were supporting for Ireland.

Acceptance of the demand will never be conceded. It is a demand which if persisted in will lead to exactly the same measure of repression as in the Southern States of America. We claim nothing more than the United States claimed for themselves and we will stand for nothing less.

Carson made the usual blatant speech that is associated with politicians of his type. He jibed President Wilson

on "the harm done by the use of absurd political phraseology" and turned one of the President's pet phrases into "making the world safe for hypocrisy." According to Carson the recent crimes in Ireland were due to ill-conditioned Americans who were bent on having his life also. This speech drew forth congratulations from Lloyd George who, during the war, had filled the world with burning words on the right of small nations to determine their own form of government. As a protest against the bill the Unionists of Donegal, Cavan and Monaghan removed Carson's pictures from their homes and meeting places. Ireland itself is much upset over the measure. The *Irish Times*, Unionist, says "the bill surrenders three-fourths of Ireland to the forces of anarchy and plants a cancer in the very heart of the Empire." The *Independent*, Nationalist, declares "the bill was framed in the assumption that the Irish people are idiots and that any abominable system of government is good enough for them." According to Cardinal Logue "The bill is worse than useless. It is engineered solely in the interests of Ulster ascendancy. The present proposals do not settle, but unsettle everything. It is useless spending time on partition proposals." John Dillon's views are as follows:

There is no reason for believing the bill is a serious or honest effort to settle the Irish question. This bill will add to the exasperation and confusion already created by the Irish executive. The Government have two objects, deceiving the American people and providing a plausible excuse for repealing the 1914 act.

Sir Horace Plunkett declares:

Not only will the bill not do, but its foundations are so rotten it is impossible to build upon them any substantial edifice of self-government. It is simply a Downing Street bill framed for the sole purpose of getting over a Downing Street difficulty.

Arthur Griffith thinks

The bill means the repetition of a measure in the worst form of that by which Redmond was duped into advising his countrymen to fight for England. It is Carson's scheme to dismember Ireland and will meet the fate of Aaron Burr's English scheme to dismember the United States.

Early in the week the British forces seized all strategic points in Ireland, warships were off the coast and a squadron was sent to Belfast to meet emergencies. This brought a reaction in America, the news of which was, as usual, carefully suppressed by most of the American papers. A large company of American women stormed the Senate, carrying banners demanding redress for Irish wrongs. Senators Gore, France and Phelan welcomed the demonstrators who addressed these, and later other Senators, as follows:

The Senate and the other governing bodies of the Democratic world gave mankind a solemn pledge that the right of self-determination should be enjoyed by all people when the great war should end. The war has ended and Ireland is still in chains.

We have come to demand the redemption of that solemn pledge. It is an intolerable affront to American patriots that the blood of our boys should have been poured out to bolster up the treachery of diplomats. It is, furthermore, a perilous thing in these days to mock at the idealism of the people.

When Senators remarked that they would appeal to

President Wilson, the women promptly replied that it was time for Congress to reclaim its freedom from executive dictation, a thing that could not be done by appealing to the President in a matter of this kind. On April 2 the women began to picket the British embassy in protest against British aggression in Ireland.

South Africa.—Four parties are contending for political leadership. They are the Unionists, who might be described as the "super-British" party; the South

The Four Parties and the Elections

African party, i. e., the followers of the late General Botha and now of General Smuts, who are working with the British and stand for the British connection; the Nationalists or Separatists, headed by Hertzog and Charles Malan, whose aim is a South African Republic entirely free and independent of England; finally there is the Labor party, headed by Colonel Cresswell. In the recent electoral campaign, an attempt was made to effect a union between the forces of General Smuts and the extremes, the strongly pro-British party and the Nationalist party. The attempt however was not successful. The real issue lay between General Hertzog and General Smuts. The policy of the former was to represent South Africa as trammelled and threatened in its vital interests by connection with the Empire. He plainly stated that owing to the imperial movement, the South African Union was faced with the alternative of becoming independent or sinking practically to a Crown colony.

General Smuts endeavored throughout the campaign to secure as much as possible the support of the moderates in both the opposing camps. He tried to point out, in opposition to the views of General Hertzog, that since August, 1914, the Dominions have made rapid progress toward a footing of complete equality with the mother country. According to him:

It was perfectly easy to cooperate with a League of Free States such as the Empire now was. There was to be no more imperial domination. They were to be masters of their own fate internally and externally, in time of war and in time of peace.

As a result of the elections General Jan Smuts has now to deal with a difficult problem. He finds the House of Assembly at Capetown divided as follows: South African party, of which he is the leader, 40 members; Nationalists, led by General Hertzog, 43; Unionists (Conservative and Imperial), 25; Labor, 21; Independents, 3; a resignation and a death leave two vacancies to be filled. As expected, the Nationalist, or Dutch Independence party, made gains. It was not expected that the Labor party, which is infected with Bolshevism and has a turbulent element within its ranks, would make any considerable headway, but it has done so. In the last Assembly, its number was only six. The Unionists, mostly colonials of British extraction, are only a little stronger than the Labor party. The latter in reality cares neither for Dutch nor English, but will cast its votes and make combinations with any group, when such action will further the interests of the proletariat.

The Schoolmaster State

JOHN C. REVILLE, S.J.

"THE children belong to the State," cried Danton in a moment of folly in the French Revolution.

The cry has been re-echoed by extremists of the school of Trotsky and Lenine. Thus crudely expressed, the sentiment is revolting. It shocks one of the fundamental instincts of our nature, and would seem doomed to win but few adherents, men ready to trample on the finest instincts of our soul. Yet here in the United States, where children, we believe, are still loved, there is a tendency to hand them over to the State, not in the unnatural sense intended by the French demagogue and the Russian Bolsheviki, but to a State, which, through a complete control of education, would mold them like potter's clay to its own ideals and will.

Such a monopoly the State has no right to claim, the parent no right to yield. Of its very nature the child is a part of the parent, "*aliquid patris*," as St. Thomas says. It belongs to him and is the extension of his personality, according to the fine commentary of Leo XIII on the words of the Angelical Doctor. Master of his own personality, of his own life and of all that concerns its essential welfare, the parent has the right, nay the duty to regulate, within proper limits and under proper conditions, the life of that being whose existence, so to speak, prolongs his own. He has authority over his child, an authority whose foundations strike deep into the roots of our nature. Leo XIII again teaches that this authority can neither be abolished nor absorbed by the State, for it has the same source as human life itself.

To the parents the child owes its existence. It looks to them, as the effect does to the cause which produced it, for the development and perfection of its being. The parents then are bound to develop the life which they communicated to their offspring. They must throw around it the rampart of those intellectual and moral safeguards which will protect it from evil and enable it to attain its destiny. In the education of the child, the parent has the place of honor, the first right, the first duty, and in every respect the most solemn responsibility. It is nature's way. It is God's law. That responsibility, personal or vicarious, cannot be shirked, no matter what human codes or constitutions may say. In the first stages of the education of the child, the authority of the father and the mother are absolutely necessary. No teacher can take the place of mother or father with the child in its infancy, no substitute can be found. They are for his first years the guides which nature and God have given him. Their charter is not man-written, or man-devised. It comes from the solemn act in which the marriage troth of husband and wife was pronounced before the altar and their bridal oaths sealed in heaven.

As the child however grows older and his mind develops, he needs an education which, at times, not even the most willing parents can give. They have not the learning or the time or the means and the opportunity necessary. They must then depute others for a task which they cannot perform. But their substitutes, their mandatories so to speak, must act loyally in their name and be faithful to their trust. They represent the parents and these have the right to see that they prolong their teaching in the spirit with which that teaching had been begun under the paternal roof. So they must watch over the education of their absent children, control it, change it entirely, when that teaching does not square with the religion or the morality in which they wish their children trained. They cannot then tolerate that the State should unconditionally assume the rights and the duties of teacher, and arrogate to itself complete control, in other words a monopoly of education.

What right has the State to turn schoolmaster, supreme, sole director of childhood and youth? When it claims the exclusive right of opening schools, mapping out programs, forming the minds and the hearts of the young, it has no foundation on which to base its claim. The parents have a title to show for the rights they demand and exercise. They are the authors of the life of the child. The family also can produce its titles. Logically and in fact it antedates civil and political society. It is the first society known to history. Society itself may not be formed unless several families coalesce together for the purpose of attaining a common end. The family is the material, the *materia proxima* out of which societies are formed. The child then belongs to the parent first, to the family, not primarily to the State as Danton pretended, as the Bolsheviki claim, and those at least indirectly demand, who, unconscious of the consequences of their theories, would yield to the State the exclusive education of the coming generation.

Unfortunately a tendency is evident in the country tamely to yield to the State, not only where its laws prescribe what a man may or may not drink, but still worse to its usurpation, when it endeavors to prescribe through State-controlled schools, what he must think. For a State-monopoly of instruction wherever tried, under a Julian or a Napoleonic despotism, under the régime of the Third French Republic, of Joseph of Austria, or under the Stars and Stripes, is a political weapon to drive men to a servile acceptance of the whims, the encroachments and the tyranny of the party in power. It is unstable, rising and falling with the growth and decay of parties. It is not a system suited for free men. As it

invariably tends to drive God, religion, and ultimately morality itself out of the classroom, it is not a system which Christians and Catholics can tolerate. Wherever attempted it has always aroused the protests of serious-minded men, many of them not belonging to the Catholic fold. "A general State education," writes John Stuart Mill, "is a mere contrivance for molding people to be exactly like one another; and as the mold in which it casts them is that which pleases the predominant power in the Government . . . in the proportion as it is efficient and successful it establishes a despotism over the mind, leading by natural tendency to *control* the body" ("On Liberty," p. 63). That despotism is growing more and more. It is the natural result of the modern glorification of the State and of its prerogatives; it is the outcome of its encroachments on forbidden territory whose gates have been flung open by the selfishness or the thoughtlessness of their guardians.

In the gradual abdication of individual rights in the matter of education, thousands have endeavored to confer upon the State a prerogative and an attribute which does not belong to it. They have tried to invest it with the teacher's rights and given it a teacher's degree. Normally, the State can claim none of these. The right and the power to teach is not one of the normal attributes of civil and temporal sovereignty. Civil society is invested with authority and jurisdiction to rule for the common welfare; its duty is to secure liberty, order and law. But knowledge and science are not, normally at least, numbered among its distinguishing marks or characteristics. Normally then, it may not teach, that is, communicate knowledge to others. The State turned teacher, pedagogue, literary, scientific dictator and autocrat, is the State usurping functions for which it was never intended, and which it can never exercise without serious danger to the individual, the family, the Church and the State itself. As far back as 1889, the eloquent Bishop of Angers, Mgr. Freppel, one of the champions of the educational rights of the family and the Church exclaimed:

The teaching State! Unless we are irremediably doomed to be the victims of the most frightful and absurd of despotisms, I hope that in a hundred years, no one will for a moment imagine that such an error could ever tyrannize over the minds of an entire people. I have said it again and again . . . the educator's function is foreign to the concept of the State, it does not enter it: for the State is the power to rule and govern, it is not the power to teach.

The statement puts the Catholic doctrine in a nutshell. Continuing, the eloquent Bishop analyzes the powers and duties belonging to the State, legislative, executive and judiciary, and concludes that nowhere is there mention of its educative or teaching power. He admits with all Catholics that the State has the right to encourage, and protect education and, to a certain very limited degree, to supervise it in order to protect if needs be, its own welfare. But he rejects the despotism of a State that would drill an entire generation under enforced

government-control and tactics to its own image and likeness.

The State then, under normal conditions, has no right to monopolize or centralize education, no right to stamp out that healthy rivalry in education, which is the source of true progress, the spur to endeavor, the mother of invention, the incentive to research, initiative and self-reliance. It may not deprive the individual of the right he has to impart his knowledge to others, provided of course that this knowledge be not detrimental to the order and welfare of the State. No right is vested in it to hamper the Church commissioned by her Divine Founder to "go and teach all nations," in fulfilling that mission untrammelled and unrestrained. It must not usurp the functions of the family or the Church. But there are certain educational functions which it may lawfully and which at times, it must perform.

The State here has real, undeniable duties and rights, even though restricted to the general purpose of the aforesaid supervision, encouragement, and protection. If the State has no right to assume to itself alone the primary and direct care of the instruction of the child, so that the State alone appoint teachers, build schools, settle curricula, and without any other reason but its will and the general and insufficient pretext of the public welfare, force children to attend its schools, yet a double duty rests upon it. One is of a negative, the other of a positive nature. With regard to the first, the commonwealth has the right and the duty to protect the child in case the parents and the family should grossly neglect its education, thus rendering it unfit to fill its place in a civilization, where the uninstructed and uneducated today suffer from a heavy handicap. In that case it may compel the parent to educate him for his future duties and take the necessary steps to enforce its decree. If the child however belongs to a Christian family, that duty falls by prior right upon the Church and only secondarily does it devolve upon the State. But not only may the State thus protect the child in this negative manner, but it can positively, though in a subordinate character, cooperate towards his education. As a subsidiary agent, it can foster, encourage, give financial and material aid, build and equip schools, pay the teachers, maintain the school plant, in as far at least as these things are beyond the capacities of the parents. It thus becomes the supplement of the parent and may be considered its deputy, provided of course that the right neither of parent nor child, in the matter especially of religion, be neglected or violated. "The good of the State might even require a certain standard of education, higher than that normally given, and the State could legitimately insist upon this standard being attained by all."

Cardinal Manning ("Characteristics," p. 82) has admirably summed up the teaching of the magnifiers of the State, and that of sound reason and of the Catholic Church, with regard to the educational functions of the commonwealth. According to him the system of "se-

cular education" means: that education primarily and properly belongs to the State; that the schools belong to the State; that the State has no religion; that the formation of the national character belongs to the State; that no one shall teach except by patent of the State. On the other hand, he writes, Christian and Catholic teaching rests upon these sound principles: the children of a Christian people have a right by Divine law to a Christian education; Christian parents have a twofold right and duty, both natural and supernatural, to guard this inheritance of their children; Christian children are in no sense the children of a State that has no religion; their formation as Christians is of higher moment than all secular instruction, and may not be postponed to it, or risked to obtain it; in the selection of teachers to whom their children shall be entrusted Christian parents have a right and a duty which excludes all other human authority; to deprive the poor of this right and liberty which is claimed by and yielded to the rich, is a flagrant injustice.

Continuing the Cardinal states that the two systems are mutually exclusive, cannot be reconciled, and that Catholics must choose between them. "The sooner we

make up our mind the safer for us. Every year we are losing ground." Will not American Catholics soon be forced to make the same admission, unless they stem the tide of State-invasion of individual, family and religious rights? With such legislation as the Smith-Towner bill and all that it means threatening the school, the family and the State itself, must they not soon be forced to say like the English Cardinal:

Every year the antagonist system, fraught with antagonistic principles, is penetrating the legislation and structure of the commonwealth, and tainting the brain and the blood of the governing classes. . . . It is throwing off Christianity from the public life of the State and relegating it to the private life of man.

These words written over thirty years ago admirably fit the very conditions Catholics and free men are now facing in the United States. They should be pondered by all earnest patriots, by every Christian and Catholic parent who does not want to abdicate and surrender to an autocratic State the sacred right which God has given him to watch over the civil freedom, the intellectual, moral and religious welfare of his child.

The First Peace Conference

A. J. MUENCH

SIGNS of the dawn of a brighter future are breaking the black veil of night which, these many years, has enveloped the nations of the world. For the first time since the outbreak of the disastrous war of five years ago, representatives of all the nations sat together again in an international congress, which just finished its sessions at Geneva. Attempts had been made, notably on the part of Socialists, to hold international congresses, even during the period of the war; but as international undertakings they proved to be a fiasco. Then came that still greater fiasco of internationalism, at the end of the war, the Peace Conference of Paris. Far from bringing nations together again as had been promised with so much rhetorical profusion of idealism, it widened the gulf created by bitterness and hatred. New seeds of hatred were sown, and these seeds have already sprouted under the heat of nationalistic sentiments. What bitter and poisonous fruits these growths may develop and mature, men of large vision, who know how to judge the history of the future, by using the past as a norm, are beginning to see. Hence their voices, growing louder and louder, demand a revision of the treaty.

The first real Peace Conference met in Geneva at the invitation of the *L'Union Internationale de Secours aux Enfants*. About 200 delegates were present, coming from all quarters of the globe. French, Germans, Serbs, Austrians Czechoslovaks, English, Bulgarians, Americans, Italians, Jugo-Slavs, Armenians, representatives in fact of great and small nations, met to discuss ways and means how to relieve the horrible distress among the

child population of Central and Eastern Europe. A spirit of peace ruled over the deliberations of the Congress. Where but a short while ago the spirit of hatred had declared with a blare of martial trumpets, it must be arms against arms, the spirit of charity now proclaimed with clear clarion call, it must be arm in arm. Formerly division, now unity. The war was not discussed, excepting as to its consequences. Politics were forgotten; statesmen were ruled out. The results of the congress were open covenants openly arrived at, no fraud, no hypocrisy, no treachery. Words were again used as they should be used, to convey and not to conceal ideas.

It was, in truth, a real peace conference and no wonder. The Vicar of the Prince of Peace sounded the key-note of good-will and reconciliation in a message which was brought to the Congress through the means of an address, opening the conference, given by the Apostolic Delegate at Berne, Mgr. Luigi Maglione. This was so much the more significant, since persons of every creed, of high and low rank, of Church and State were assembled at this international gathering. In his address, his Excellency showed what great interest the Holy Father had taken in the movement of peace and charity; how his heart was set upon the ideal that the charity and the justice of Christ might again rule in the world; and how he proved the worth of charity with deeds by his contribution of 4,000,000 lire to the fund of the *L'Union Internationale*. Two millions of this came from the Venetian provinces which had

been subjected to greater hardships of warfare than any other province of Italy. This also was a propitious sign, showing that peoples easily forget wrongs and insults and make generous sacrifices, if only they serve to bind nations together again with strong, unbreakable bonds. In truth, humanity which had cloaked its face for shame these many, many months, because of the outrages that had been heaped upon the world, again showed a smiling face.

Throughout all the sessions of the Congress there was heard this dominant note of peace and good-will. Practically every one of the speakers expressed it as his conviction that this Congress would help to soften prejudices and tend to lift people to a level where they would see with larger vision the necessity of a genuine international understanding. Sir David Henderson, General Director of the League of Societies of the Red Cross, most emphatically declared it the duty of every delegate to impress upon their governments the necessity of unselfish cooperation to the end that reconstruction would be real and earnest, so as to put strength and backbone again into broken nations.

The importance of fostering this spirit of charity must, indeed, not be overlooked. Unless charity first cools and tempers hot-headed national sentiments, works of well-balanced and even-handed justice are out of the question. Charity together with justice are the two pillars upon which the new social order must be rebuilt. None emphasized this stronger than Mr. Murphy, representative of the American Relief Commission in Europe. He made it quite plain that the American people were willing to dig down into their pockets still more deeply than heretofore whenever further aid might be necessary, but, he added, all this matter of relief can be nothing more than a temporary arrangement, bridging over to the more solid and permanent movement of clear, plain, common-sense action in the political and economic life of all nations. Unless this is done, all the eloquence about reconstruction and its ideals, is like sand before the wind, blinding peoples who are eagerly looking forward to brighter and better days.

The Congress faced a formidable task in striving to solve the many problems of how best to save the lives of children in disease and death-stricken Europe. The immediate needs are still immense. Europe is now facing a very critical period. The stores of food which had been gathered and which had been rationed out with scrupulous carefulness during these long winter months, are fast melting away like the snow before the warmer and warmer rays of the sun. The hardships resulting therefrom are horrible to contemplate. In the train to Geneva I met a little Vienna girl, thirteen years of age, on her way to a Swiss family in a little mountain village. Better days awaited her there. She had hardly as much as tasted milk in the past year. In Vienna children to the age of one year receive about a pint of milk per day; from the age of one to six years they receive condensed

milk, and those beyond that age receive no milk at all. Half a pound of potatoes, the same amount of flour, one loaf of bread, a pound of meat are rationed out to each person once a week. Otherwise they subsist on vegetables, mostly turnips. This little girl had come with 600 other Viennese children to partake of the generous hospitality of the Swiss people for a period of from two to three months. Switzerland has already done heroic work in this respect. According to a careful estimate of Mr. R. de Tavel, President of the Swiss Central Committee for suffering German and Austrian children, about 8,000,000 francs have already been expended through means of the hospitalization of these children in Swiss families; evidently an enormous sum for a small country like Switzerland. This country is, indeed, one of the few bright spots in Europe. Here humanity has been tried and proved to be as genuine as gold. Switzerland has written glorious pages for itself during the terrible days of the war, in caring for the sick, wounded and homeless soldiers and people of neighboring nations; and it is still writing them in its aftermath, pages of which its descendants will be justly proud. Enclosed on all sides by war-stricken countries, it sees with its own eyes the terrible horrors of the late war. It has not lost its vision for them. Lord Robert Cecil, whose brother Lord William Cecil, Bishop of Exeter, read a letter of his at the Congress, said well in his communication:

If men in England and in the United States, and in other countries, seem to be indifferent to this great movement of relief, it is not because they are ungenerous or even unselfish, but because they are unimaginative. Preoccupied with many affairs in business and in government, they have not brought home to themselves what ravages famine and disease have inflicted upon the innocent victims of the war.

When men see misery, it is usually not difficult to stir them to activity. It is needed only that they learn to see.

Imaginations were vividly stimulated by the reports read at the Congress. They carried with them the emotions of the living voice of men and women who had witnessed the horrors with their own eyes, and who had worked with the meager means at their disposal most heroically to stave off still greater disaster. I can only cite a few cases, but as these are quite typical of all the others, it is safe, in this instance, to conclude to general conditions. The average weight of boys and girls, fourteen years of age, was nine pounds less in 1918 than in 1914, according to tests made in the largest cities of Central Europe. This makes plain the dangers of under-development. Due to this, tuberculosis has increased to an alarming extent. In Prussia it has increased 68 per cent, in Hessen 124.4 per cent, in Mecklenburg-Schwerin 128 per cent. Thirty-two thousand children are sick in the city of Leipsic, due to under-nourishment. In the city of Budapest five dispensaries for tuberculosis persons are unable to take care of all the patients; the number is so large that twelve or fourteen would be needed. Vienna, perhaps, shows worse

conditions than any other section of Central Europe. Out of a child population, up to fifteen years of age, of 340,000, about 332,504, or nearly 98 per cent are undernourished. Practically every child in this city is suffering from varying degrees of undernourishment. And no small wonder. This is how one of the reports describes conditions in Vienna.

Vienna now looks slovenly, there is little traffic and one seldom sees merchandise carted; cabs are few and far between. The automobiles one sees appear to belong to foreign missions and to the numerous military commissions of the Entente. Milk carts, bakers' and butchers' carts are rare; stores are open, but often empty. In the market one finds cabbages, swedes, carrots, turnips, small second-rate apples and similar potatoes. Cats and dogs are very few; many of them ended as sausages. The horses are thin, but well-kept—many a cabman looks more starved than his beast.

The American Relief Commission is finding a wide field for work in this city. At the Congress the distressing announcement was made that its funds will allow it to continue its relief work only until about the beginning of August of this year. Who will then feed the three-million mouths, which the American Commission feeds every day, is difficult to say. It is quite certain that the distress will not be conquered even in its greatest extent by next winter. Conditions in Europe are too unsettled. They cannot be righted even within a year.

The real solution must be sought in making it possible for people to work again on a reasonable basis. There is no lack of will to work. But there is lack of raw materials and financial credit. In granting these, financial interests may, perhaps, have to sacrifice precious gains. But their duty of sacrifice in this matter is plain. Charity is a duty, but no less justice. The world sometimes seems to forget this.

The City of the Angels

RT. REV. A. E. BURKE, P. A.

HE who has visited Puebla, the "City of the Angels," will not soon forget its marvels and its beauty. We had just rounded the great Sierras and before us spread a panorama of rich fields, towering mountains and rare blue sky. To the westward rose the lofty peaks of Popocatepetl and Ixtaccihuatl, their snow-covered summits looking in reality whiter than snow itself in the setting sunlight. Out to the north stood the mighty Malintzi, to the east was the Cofre de Orizaba, and in the southwest the pyramid of Cholula, with the two white towers of Nuestra Señora de los Remedios showing up as distinctly as the mountain summits, and rivaling them in dazzling whiteness, while nestled snugly in beauty and security at their feet lay Puebla town, *Puebla de los Angeles*.

As our train ran into it, we could not help noticing the innumerable church domes and towers. Even Rome's sky-line is not so filled with them. No wonder that Puebla has also received the name of the "City of

Churches." In their tintings, too, the builders of these wonderful edifices had exhausted the whole color scheme: San Agustín is pure white; San José, red; Santa Teresa, yellow; the Campaña, blue; San Francisco, buff; Santo Domingo, white; San Cristobal, red; the Carmen, yellow; San Angel de Aualco, red; and the Soledad, white; whilst rising high above them all, the majestic brownish-grey twin towers of the Cathedral rivet our admiring gaze. Yet these are a few only of the sanctuaries in and about Puebla. At every turn a beautiful church confronts the astonished visitor.

The first Bishop, the saintly Zumárraga, often journeyed to Mexico City. Tradition declares that once, in transit, when he encamped for the night by the trailside, he had a vision in which he saw the Angels, with chain and quadrant, laying out a town, with streets at right angles and spacious squares, between two well-defined hills known to every traveler of the period. He awoke and the impression was so strong and vivid upon him that he ordered the construction of the town in the very place and form, indicated by the Angels. Moreover, from this peculiar incident, it acquired its celestial appellation, Puebla of the Angels, which still remains in use.

There, in the spacious Casa de Velázquez, I had my first experience of the beauty, simplicity and purity of Mexican family life. Don Francisco, my host, had been obliged to flee the country at the Revolution. He had spent several years of exile in Cuba and was now back in his own commodious mansion, which, like so many more, had nearly fallen into the possession of the soldiery in his absence. The mansion fronted upon a wide and stately street, and consisted of three stories and a cupola, with a most ample patio in the center. There were wide halls, grand salons, and comfortable apartments on the second story. Here too was the oratory, where for generations this distinguished family had knelt in prayer. My apartments, parlor, library, bedroom, bathroom, ran along the western side. Priests or chaplains had occupied them for many years when religion was in full flower in Mexico. A most beautiful, broad and luxurious stairway gave easy access to the living rooms. Its pillars were of solid stone graven with Aztec figures and the wainscoting was done in blue tiles. A splendid mansion it was indeed, and in it lived a family of real Christian people, with their retinue of servants, from the Indian population, pious, honest, efficient, devoted and industrious as any I have ever seen. I stopped with them several days, said Mass for them in the oratory, enjoyed their tender solicitude, and left greatly edified and uplifted. Never had I lived in a more truly Christian atmosphere. The tender affection of the parents for each other and for their children, the dutiful regard of the children for their parents, and the love and willing service of the domestics for their masters, will be a source of edification to me as long as I live. All who were of an age to do so, servants and people, attended Mass, and

received Holy Communion each morning. The Master of the mansion served at the Holy Sacrifice with the grace, reverence and devotion of a young recluse.

There was to be a state dinner for the distinguished attendants at a convention next day at 1:30 p. m.; and the grand house was turned into a great dining hall, as quickly and effectually as if by magic. Here were advocates, doctors, professors, poets, journalists and clergymen. The Archbishop and Bishops in cassock and ferraiola; the others in evening dress. It was a magnificent spread, presided over by Don Pancho with grace and a proper solicitude for every one's comfort. A superb orchestra discoursed appropriate music. In the end, the host read telegrams, made a brief announcement about the concluding seance that night, and thanked all, especially my poor self, for our condescending presence. There was an attendance of over eighty persons and the dinner went off without a single hitch. Remarkable to say, except for a few waiters, the whole thing was accomplished within the Velazquez household.

At night we went to the College Hall for the closing meeting of the convention. The program was a most pretentious one. The hall is spacious, the chapel of the new Jesuit College, transformed for the occasion. The choir-loft was filled with the grouped choirs of the city. The musical feature proved to be most admirable. Before its execution one of the first maestros of Puebla delivered a short appreciation of the great musical masters; and his views were exemplified by the subsequent numbers of the program. The place was packed with people, prelates, priests, etc.—even the stage being occupied to its last inch of space. There were original poems, grandly declaimed (Mexico is really a land of poets today); papers on subjects left over from other sessions, and a splendid discourse by the distinguished Jesuit scientist J. Gustavo de Heredia, F. R. S. C., on Spiritism, every word of which I understood in Spanish, and greatly appreciated for its merit. Father de Heredia met the seductive propaganda now in full swing under the leadership of Lodge and Doyle, and unmasking it, left nothing but its ugliness to be seen; and, being seen, scrupulously to be avoided. There were addresses and compositions of such a high order on this program and every piece was so faultlessly presented that I said to myself: "I only wish that our best and most cultured centers could hear this; it would surely open their eyes." As a matter of fact, we could not begin to duplicate it anywhere in North America. These were the people, too, whom a number of vulgar *nouveaux riches*, now inclined to philanthropy, were going to uplift and save!

At eleven o'clock the efficient and cultured president, feeling the inappropriateness of lengthy speech briefly thanked the audience and announced the close of a remarkable Semana Social with two hymns, the religious and the national, thus rendering to Cæsar what was Cæsar's and to God what was God's. I returned home,

with my host after bidding adieu to the prelates, for I fully intended getting back to Mexico next morning. But it was not to be. I was told that the beauty and charm of Puebla would never suffer such a slight. I could not, studiously, put slight upon them; so I stayed. It was well worth while for I not only saw the institutions of Puebla, but, also, the wonderful Indian remains of Cholula, nearby. Next day was Sunday, too; and I assisted at the solemn Te Deum in the Cathedral.

The latter is really a very majestic structure and fitting climax to the wonderful church-building activities of this "City of Churches." In everything but size, many think, it outrivals the great Cathedral of Mexico City, which truly ranks as one of the greatest temples in the world. It is magnificently situated on the Plaza Mayor, and is of Roman architecture, 323 feet long, by 101 feet wide. Two square towers, surmounted by golden crosses, pierce the air at the height of 150 feet. There is a beautiful dome of equal elevation. This Plaza Mayor is a large square filled with rare trees and flowers, and is used as the principal breathing space of the city.

The interior of this church, I believe, excels in beauty that of any other in Mexico. Nowhere, in my opinion, can such rich and seemly interior disposition and decoration be found outside of St. Peter's in Rome. The high altar, which cost \$110,000, is magnificent, the work of a Mexican artist named Tolsa, who fashioned it out of the innumerable varieties of marble for which Mexico is noted, and the beautiful Pueblan onyx. The latter is also used in the massive pulpit standing between the choir and the altar. The organ, the doors and the stalls of the canons, as well as the Bishop's *cathedra*, are wonderful specimens of handicraft, made from a collection of Mexican woods, exquisitely carved, and inlaid with precious stones. The side chapels are all of the richest in decoration, and fit into the whole interior scheme, forming the frame of one sublime picture. In this sacred precinct, then, the organ pealing its notes of joy and the cantors carrying on the verses of vocal praise, the officiating Bishop, surrounded by the clergy, intoned the Te Deum. I never witnessed a more entrancing scene.

We saw the inside of the churches after that, and then made the trip to Cholula. The traveler gets so used to the elaborate decoration of altars and sanctuaries here that he soon ceases to marvel at them. Carving in wood and gilding in gold, after the Spanish style, was the most elaborate work in the world; and in these sanctuaries the monks or artists left nothing undone. The whole sanctuary in some cases, walls and ceiling and the altar in the center, is one mass of gold carving, relieved by innumerable images of Our Lord and His Saints in the same exquisite handiwork. The altars are wonderfully beautiful in themselves. I suppose there is enough gold in the sanctuaries of these old Pueblan churches to fit out a modern armament.

There were sad cases of sequestration of churches and religious institutions in Puebla. The Bishop's Palace was made into a barracks and the splendid Jesuit University, with its superior astronomical equipment, was also turned into a shelter for soldiers. Many of the convents were pillaged, and the celebrated Dr. Atl, now much in unenviable public prominence, bought for a trifle a whole street of tenements belonging to the Church of Santa Clara. These properties were needed as means of support, and they should not have been taken away without national necessity and compensation. I believe all the institutions necessary to the exercise of religion will be restored. Some have been restored already.

Going to Cholula, we passed through the beautiful Atoyac Valley. As we approach the little town, the great pyramid stands out in bold relief, until it completely dominates the view. We leave our conveyance in the ancient market-place, which is very much today as it was four centuries ago when Cortés came. This was the center of a great Indian nation; and the pyramid which dates back thousands of years, had on its summit, when the Christians arrived, a temple dedicated to Quetzalcoatl, the god of the air.

The pyramid itself is an immense structure, greater than Cheops, though unlike San Juan Teotihuacán and others in this country or Egypt in formation. It is more like a natural hill overgrown with plants and shrubs and trees. It was laid out with great exactness, however, its four sides facing the cardinal points of the compass and ascends, terrace upon terrace, until the top is reached at 177 feet above the plain. Its base covers twenty acres of land, so you have an idea of its size. From the balconies or terraces, as one ascends, the view of the valley, the surrounding mountains and the many

tilled church roofs and towers glinting in the sun, is surpassingly beautiful. There are other minor pyramids, looking now like great earth-mounds, but really constructions of baked clay bricks, and carefully designed.

This was evidently a great religious center, in the far-off ages, the holy city of Anahuac. The town of Cholula has dwindled now to only 5,000 inhabitants, as purely Indian as ever they were. It was once a vast population. Cortés declares that he counted 400 towers, in the City of Cholula alone, when he first came; and no temple had more than two of these towers; so it must have been a regular Indian Mecca. The Christians endeavored to build their temples on the sites of the chief pagan ones, so as to wean the neophytes, all the better, from their false gods. There are churches all around the plain, near Cholula. The stranger naturally asks what they are for, there being no community, not even a single family about them, but is quickly told that the Indians themselves built them—beautiful churches they are—and that they all are connected with some special devotion or tradition. Wo betide the reformer who would dare to touch them! Near the Plaza is the great monastery of San Francisco, built in 1529, and close by, the Royal Chapel and Third Order Chapel, an immense structure whose roof and dome are supported by sixty-four massive round columns. It was constructed, in 1608, for overflow gatherings. With all these great churches about, one cannot now well see the utility of such an immense edifice, but we must remember what a densely populated place Cholula was then, and that, as a religious center, it gathered the indigenes for hundreds of miles round. This great chapel was richly furnished, too, containing, as do all those old churches, the accumulated treasures of the ages.

Belgium and Socialism

J. VAN DER HEYDEN

IN the name of the "sacred union" proclaimed at the outbreak of the war, King Albert surrounded himself all through the trying years of the conflict with ministers and counselors from the three great political parties. In coming to an agreement with the extremists, principles were often strained and suffered sundry rents, condemned by the clear and far-sighted, to whom concessions spell gradual defeat. But for all that, there were but few Belgians, when the King returned into his own, who did not wish the sacred union to continue at least during the restoration period. At the armistice a coalition ministry was, therefore, wisely resolved on; but the conditions of the coalition were unfortunate and were settled without consultation and discussion with Catholics, albeit they had carried the last elections held before the war. They were, it was then rumored, given the alternative either of governing with

Liberals and Socialists or of having no part in the Government at all. Although they foresaw the ruinous consequences of the ill-omened conditions of the hybrid combination, for patriotic reasons they accepted the task laid upon them. The result of the November elections bore out their forebodings, put a seal of approval upon the coalition system of government and gave to Socialists a stronger claim than ever to participation in that government.

What are they now doing for their share? Are they making good? In days when they were lying in wait for their opportunity to sway the rod of empire they promised us marvels. Their advent into power was to bring about the millenium, universal content and happiness. The bourgeois society was rotten and had shown itself as incompetent to govern as its predecessors, the aristocrats, of French pre-revolutionary times.

Having heard them declaim with such bold assertiveness, we were entitled to think that they had their program all ready, a program that needed but to be applied to fill every one with admiration and make the whole world desire to live under the blessed rule of Socialism.

Their chance has come in Belgium and already their leaders' declamations are fewer and an octave or so lower. Far from making good their promises of a model, righteous and profitable administration, they exploit with shocking unconcern the public treasury and increase the already heavy burdens of the tax-payers without an equivalent of compensating advantages.

It was quite natural for the public to expect that the Socialists would at least do their very best to show what they were capable of and what blessedness the country might expect from an altogether Socialist regime. Instead of that they are showing either a perfect incompetency to rule or the most shameful malice.

The tax-payers are, of course, not going to have themselves plucked and bested without a protest; and the press keeps the public posted wherever it succeeds in ferreting out some maladministration of the chiefs presiding in the ministerial departments, members of the party of empty promises and few deeds. It is not easy to get at the truth with these gentlemen; for they understand quite well how to keep their secrets hidden and they conceal the defects of one another. Murder must out some day; however; and one paper, *La Libre Belgique*, has already edified us with several instances of the ruinous business methods of the Food Dictator, Minister Wauters.

Whilst Belgian farmers cannot secure from Minister Wauters, who has the distribution of all staple cattle-food, the bran needed to feed their stock, one single wholesale merchant boasts that he exported 15,000,000 kilos of bran to France, a thing he could not have done without the Minister's connivance. Because of the dearth of milk for children, the sick and the aged, dairymen are inhibited in certain districts, from making butter, but must deliver the milk to the Food Dictator, through whose fault the kine remain underfed.

The same Minister Wauters controls also the beet-sugar production and sale. Now, last June, the farmers had contracted to sell their sugar-beets to the refineries for 73.50 frs. a ton but, after some time, the Minister stepped in, by a stroke of the pen annulled all the contracts, and, to secure the sugar-beet producers' vote, it was whispered, fixed the prices at 91.50 frs. a ton, which spelled an increase of 0.60 to the kilo for the consumer.

During the years 1918 and 1919 the sugar production in Belgium was so large that there would have been plenty for home consumption, if the Minister had had the interests of the country at large at heart. At first he made it appear that he had; for he forbade the exportation of the product of our refineries without license; then, not only did he give license to the refineries to export millions of pounds to France, but it appears that he sold even to stockbrokers; for one Socialist broker

was found to have secured more than 100,000 kilos which he disposed of at usurious rates to the Socialist municipality of Roubaix-Tourcoing, France. The result of it all is that we have been put on rations from March 1 on, at the rate of two pounds of sugar per month and per head; and that the chocolate factories of Antwerp have closed their doors, throwing hundreds of people out of employment. The manufacturers have the alternative of buying exotic sugar at double the price of the home-made; but they dare not risk it, because they know that the Food Dictator has immense stocks of American chocolate in reserve that he has not been able to get rid of thus far; but which it will be no trouble at all to sell, if the indigenous chocolate must be sold at double the present price.

According to a ministerial circular of last November, native sugar was sold at a profit to the State of ten francs a hundred kilos. That profit represents at present nine million francs. This was to serve to pay for the difference on the quantity of foreign sugar necessary to make up for the possible shortage of home production. Now that the shortage is announced and chocolate makers are invited to buy foreign sugar at twice the price of the home product, the Minister does not offer to pay the difference and the public asks, but in vain, what became of the nine-million surplus on past scales.

Sugar and bran are two items upon the list of transactions not at all to the credit of our Socialist Food Department. There are others. For instance, last September Wauters was selling cheddar to wholesalers for 8.75 frs. a kilo, whilst a Belgian importer from Canada secured the same quality of cheese for 5.55 frs. a kilo and undersold the Minister, who paying normal prices, sells at abnormal ones and exploits the public, unless forsooth he bought the merchandise higher than did the private importer, in which case he revealed poor business acumen. In either supposition it is the long-suffering public that is bested.

A cheese-deal with Holland did not prove more creditable than the former one with Canada. It was announced by his department a fortnight in advance that Wauters was about to purchase large quantities of cheese across the northern borders. Our good Dutch friends, of course, were not slow in taking the hint: they raised the price of the article of which they had an immense surplus stock; and their Government hastened to fix export duties at 2 frs. a kilo. Meanwhile the same Dutch merchants continued to sell cheese two francs cheaper to their old Belgian customers than to the Food Department; and Belgian retailers sold each of the four qualities of cheese retailed by the Minister two francs below the ministerial price.

What became of the Socialist cheese? It is not likely that the Minister found purchasers against such competition? Who knows but that it will in the end have to go the way of 600 boxes of herring thrown into the Schelde, because unfit for consumption, and of the bacon bought

from the American bases at Antwerp, which is almost ready to walk out of the warehouses. Decidedly, our Socialist Food Minister is not yet the precursor of the golden age promised by Socialism.

Worse than this, his budget for the year 1920 foresees expenditures to the extent of one billion and a half francs for the purchase of foodstuffs at home and abroad, and one billion three-hundred fifty-nine millions returns from the sale of these goods, a deficit thus of one hundred and forty-one million francs. The tax-payers do not ask that the State coin money out of its business transactions, but neither do they relish the idea of paying for bad management, incompetency, or favoritism, if not worse.

A better administration surely was Mr. H. Hoover. Not only did he pay for all expenses, but he left a surplus of several million francs of which the educational institutions of the land were the beneficiaries; but then Mr. Hoover is not a Socialist. Verily, the Socialist experiment in Belgium is not such as to awaken enthusiasm for like experiments elsewhere. Will it cure Belgian voters? The future will tell.

Truth or Sentimentalism?

RICHARD A. MUTTKOWSKI, PH.D.

ON February second, so the fable runs, the groundhog leaves his burrow, casts a knowing glance at the hillsides and a weatherwise look at the sky. If he sees his shadow, his winter sleep must last another six weeks. If the sky is sullen and overcast, the prognosis is that Mr. Groundhog's sleep will be cut short several weeks by an early spring. Some years ago, several hundred boy scouts stood guard at all the groundhog holes in the neighborhood. Needless to say, they saw no groundhog emerge. The story is a fable, of the same category with certain other favorite animal stories, such as that of the ostrich seeking escape from pursuit by hiding its head in the sand; the story of the "hoop snake," or the tale of thirsting caravans saved by water obtained from the stomach stores of a camel.

I expatiated on this and other matters to a fellow-educator, remarking the difficulty of eradicating popular misbeliefs. And this was the parting shot I received:

Well, why not? Why not let them believe it if they find pleasure in it? I am sure the people who believe in the Divinity of Christ are happier than those who do not.

Humph! And also, tut! What a bewildering answer! Here we like to call this a scientific age, the age of truth-seeking. Science arrogantly proclaims its search for truth. "We believe naught we cannot prove." But an educator supposedly imbued with the scientific spirit, remarks, "Let them believe if they find pleasure." Are we scientific only in unimportant things, and unscientific in the things that really count? Business is "scientific" these days, all affairs being guided by scientific efficiency. Standards have been fixed for both men and machines.

Indeed, not only physically, but morally and mentally we are to be impressed into certain standard patterns, although the moral standards pertain to non-essentials rather than vital matters. For instance, our habits of recreation, such as drink, tobacco, cards, and the like, are to be regulated, while the social evil and divorce courts continue with little molestation.

"I am sure that those who believe in the Divinity of Christ are happier than those who do not." Either Christ was honest, or the greatest impostor the world has ever seen. If honest, He is God; if an impostor, then his work surely must have been destroyed centuries ago. With all admiration for the great epics and the inventive capacities of literary geniuses, I believe that to invent a "life of Christ" as written by the Evangelists would defy the powers of the most inspired hashish-dreamer. Yet the testimony of His reality is abundant. And the best proof of His existence and of His Divinity is the Church He sponsored, which has lived unimpaired through the centuries and whose organization wins the admiration even of its enemies.

"Why not let them believe if they find pleasure in it?" What a remark! And what a mentality to conceive it! Yet, he was not an ignorant person who said it, but a person that is normal. I might even say, a normal American. But it is evident from the reply that the speaker's criterion was pure sentimentalism. In that respect the speaker is typical of too many Americans these days. Sentiment forms the basis of the religion of many who call themselves Christian. "Believe what you will, as long as you feel happy." Now it is apparent that that is the precise criterion of most non-Catholic Christians. Their knowledge of Christianity is based upon occasional Sunday-school visits and a few rare sermons. But Sunday-school stories and sermons do not constitute creed. Information as flimsy on any subject as that possessed by most people on the subject of Christianity would be scorned. Yet, Christianity is simple and logical if properly understood. But to acquire this understanding necessitates at least as much study as any of the three "R's." A teaching of Christianity is wholly lacking in the public schools. Hence, whatever knowledge of Christianity is acquired is through the agency of Sunday-school, Sunday sermons, and the home. How little this is, need not be averred. But the ensuing fact is that whatever beliefs are held are vague and without the necessary logical and historical basis. Women adhere chiefly because of sentiment and social interests, while men, missing the logical exposition of creed, ignore church almost entirely.

In recent years Protestants have worked a great deal to perfect their organization, forgetting that organization can hardly be a substitute for creed, and that the best organization must ultimately collapse unless it has a logical foundation and definite aims to hold its members together. Further, many Protestant activities are sentimental, and therefore, inconsequential and ineffective.

Bible societies distribute Bibles, and proceed to number their owners as Christians. Now, I possess a copy of the Koran, but would protest emphatically against being numbered among the Moslems. Missionary activities are often inappropriate in that they seek to change natives into poor imitations of white men, ignoring the customs of race and exigencies of climate. Societies make clothing for the tropical heathen; but a scantier, if decent, attire is far better for the tropical savage, as the oil on his oiled skin constitutes better protection against insects and a better watershed against tropical showers than all the white man's paraphernalia called clothing. Ask anthropologists what they think of the missionary zeal that seeks to transform natives into white men regardless of customs and climate.

The same sentimentalism and utter lack of logic have affected various reform movements. Immigrants must be "Americanized" by being taught to speak English. As if the ability to converse in English could make good citizens and ardent patriots! A more inconsequential method of Americanization could hardly be devised. Labor must not strike because a few unions misused their power and struck when their power was felt most keenly. The nation must be dry, because a small percentage of men has insufficient will power to be moderate. Murderers must not be killed, as death might hurt them. Yet where is the pity for the murdered? Vivisection must be stopped. Yet how shall surgeons obtain knowledge of the activities of the human body and perfect their technique for operations? No doubt, men have been cruel at times in their experiments on living animals. But "butchers" are abhorred in the laboratory; they make poor surgeons, and fortunately are very few in number.

In seeking legislation, the various reform societies are proceeding with much the same fatuous irresponsibility as the maid who spilled the baby with the bath. Get a law passed and all is well. Some years ago I read in a dental magazine some verses entitled, "Pass a Law."

If your neighbor smokes,
Tells you pointless jokes,
Pass a law.

If your minister's a bore,
And his dogmas make you roar,
Pass a law.

If the sun-light hurts your eyes,
And your friends all tell you lies,
Pass a law.

Now that the Prohibitionists and the Anti-Saloon League have been awarded with signal success, the prospects of the Anti-Tobacco League, the Anti-Corset, Anti-High Heel, Anti-Vivisection, and all other anti-leagues are decidedly encouraging. Most certainly, should their pet reforms be enacted into law, Americans will be the most ruled and standardized people of the world. Indeed, it will need armies of citizens to enforce all the laws; by and by we shall all be government employees,

earning our pay by watching one another. Then, surely, the millennium will have been reached.

Act and believe only what "makes you happy" is hardly a proper criterion. Passing a law to make a few happy is not representative government. The criterion of all laws should be "For the common good." The commonwealth, therefore, cannot bother with sentimentalism, but must develop its laws logically; for the needs are logical, and the exposition of these needs must be logical to find proper adjustment.

So is education for the common good. And that common good demands that no matter what the subject taught, whether religion, science, or the humanities, the truth, logically developed, shall be the only criterion. As an educator I would be a weird specimen if I were to permit students to believe preconceived notions merely because "it makes them happy." The examination periods regularly uncover hosts of misbeliefs, and students, I am sure, would be perfectly willing and happy if their beliefs went uncensored. Unfortunately, as a pedantic sort of person, I still incline to the old-fashioned criterion "Is this true? Is this fact?" and hence make some of the students bitterly unhappy. A cruel world. But sentimentalism has no place in education. Nor should it have any place in politics, in law, or in any of the interrelations necessitated by social intercourse.

COMMUNICATIONS

Letters as a rule should not exceed six-hundred words

Help for German Jesuits

To the Editor of AMERICA:

As Professor of Theology at the University of Innsbruck, I have, since 1908, come into close contact with many Americans, and I know that full confidence can be placed in their generosity. I therefore venture to draw your attention to a great need, I mean the present critical condition of the German Jesuits. The Catholics of the United States probably do not realize the difficulties of the German Jesuit province as the result of the war. All its members of German nationality were expelled from their flourishing Indian mission. Many of them went to Holland, the refuge of the German Jesuits since 1872, overcrowding the houses. The income of these houses is exclusively derived from German sources, as the Fathers are not allowed to work in Holland in behalf of souls. Their expenses, on the other hand, must be paid in Dutch money. In consequence of the depreciation of the German currency it is impossible to support the novices and clerical students for any length of time. Instead of four marks, as before the war, the daily expense for each is forty-five marks. The funds are being rapidly exhausted.

The revolution has removed many of the obstacles put in the way of the work of the Fathers in Germany by the former Government, and new residences may now be established, but the present monetary condition has brought with it other insurmountable difficulties. The prices of houses and other property have risen incredibly, and the rapidly sinking funds of the province preclude the possibility of purchasing or building new residences. Though the good Catholic people joyfully welcome the returning Fathers, they are too impoverished through the war and the revolution to provide them with the necessary means. In this desperate state of affairs the German Jesuits turn for help to the Catholics of the United States. Since their expulsion from Germany in 1872, they have been sending a

great number of men to America, and the United States is much indebted to their apostolic labors.

It would be easy for the American priests and Faithful to help in their turn Catholic Germany by lending some financial assistance to the German Jesuits on their return after their exile of forty-four years. God would bless them for it, and the German Fathers, as well as the poor German Catholics, would never cease to thank their American brethren. Let me give you one particular instance to throw some light on the present calamitous situation. Before the war the Fathers started building a house of retreats in Berlin. It has not been completed as the work is now six times more costly. The heavy debts on the unfinished building cannot be paid off. During the next few weeks or months it will be decided whether the enterprise will end in ruin. And yet, just now we require Catholic men of character to withstand the forces of infidelity, and the establishment of such a house in the chief city of Germany would be of vital importance.

Financial aid given to the German Jesuits is, therefore, under the present circumstances an eminently Catholic work. I wish to recommend their case earnestly to the generosity of the American Catholics. Much help might be given by contributing even small sums, by granting loans without interest, and by sending Mass stipends. Gifts should be sent to the Rev. Thomas Brühl, Exaten bei Baexem, Holland.

Bonn.

H. BRUDERS, S.J.

Catholics and Church-Building

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The excellent article entitled "A Noteworthy Experiment," written by John T. Comes in AMERICA for March 27, is indeed gratifying, for it shows that there is at least one who has an active appreciation of the deplorable type, or lack of type, of American Catholic churches. The writer, too, hopes for an improvement in church-building and looks to the Bishops in conjunction with architects to "work out a comprehensive practical plan to take our art out of the present vicious system and place it back into the position it occupied in former ages." But is it true that, even if the Bishops and Catholic architects were to attempt such a plan, the difficulty would be solved? I think not. Architecture, as all art, is the spontaneous expression of the ideals of an age and, while it would be consoling to believe that the church horrors in this country are not the exact expression of American Catholic ideals, but rather the distorted expression of those ideals in which the distortion is due to the commercialism of architects and the inactivity of representative bodies of the clergy, still, such does not actually seem to be the case.

As Catholics we believe that the excesses of philosophy, science, art and all other human activities are due to the neglect of the doctrines taught by Christ and His successors, and the vagaries of church-building are no exception to the rule. If we are to improve our architecture, therefore, it would seem that we should first try to discover what spiritual force was responsible for the mystical architecture of the Middle Ages. Invariably we shall find that it was an active and enthusiastic devotion to the Blessed Sacrament and it is clear that a revivification of this devotion is essential before we need discuss its manifestation in church-building. Such a revival would mean churches as crowded at daily Mass as they are now on Sundays, while all the Faithful in attendance would receive Holy Communion. Not until this ideal is reached, may we hope to have churches that are fit dwellings for Christ in the Blessed Sacrament, as we had in the Ages of Faith when the church was the central building in every village and Christ in the Blessed Sacrament was the inspiration of every church. Without this general movement to follow the urgings of the Pope upon whose tomb it is written that he strove to "Renew all things in Christ," the return of Gothic architecture artificially developed in high circles, will be more than analogously the same as its adoption in Protestant church-building,

where, despite the technical excellence of the craftsmanship employed, there is, in the absence of the inspiration of the Real Presence, an unmistakably pathetic inanity.

The ideals of the great majority of our Catholics are, I fear, too faithfully expressed in the Catholic churches of this country, just as the exact and logical interpretation of present-day materialism will best be found in the contemplated Christian Science "church" soon to be erected on Fifth Avenue in the style of an office-building with stores on the ground floor and one floor reserved for very wealthy and very solemn audiences that will gather once a week to hear a chapter from "Science and Health."

Christian Scientists should not build Gothic churches, but Catholics should and will build them, when they realize once more the importance of the central Sacrament of their Faith, the Holy Eucharist. This done, Bishops and architects will do the rest.

New York.

TERENCE L. CONNOLLY, S. J.

Extravagance of the "Common People"

To the Editor of AMERICA:

May one who thinks himself to be one of the "common people" ask a question? Just whom do Mr. West in AMERICA for February 21, and Miss Le Tourneux in its issue of March 20, mean by the "common people"? From Mr. West's article, a careful reader concludes that in upholding the rights of the "common people," Mr. West refers to the good, honest, upright, hard-working laborer who has the lawful and praiseworthy ambition to better his condition, who honestly strives to attain a higher standard of living, who tries to make ends meet—a seemingly impossible Herculean effort in these days—after paying the bonnet bill, the boot bill and the beefsteak bill.

Miss Le Tourneux seems to take as her models of the common people, foolish shopgirls who spend their money on water-wave hair-dressing, not to mention tinted cheeks; young factory hands, foolish also, if they array themselves in "new-found finery" before they better the conditions of "squalid tenements" from which they issue; the working-man, who, arrayed in "shining splendor," pampers, in his search for excitement, the delights of the senses, who "turns his back upon home," thus proving himself one of those whose names are legion.

Is the extravagance of the common people to be established as a fact upon such models? And yet, after furnishing us with such examples, Miss Le Tourneux concludes of the workman: "He is extravagant."

A marcelle wave, so I am told, may easily be a home-made not-costing-a-cent adornment, the rightful privilege of any who may have the laudable ambition to look well; but expensive clothes, with which Miss Le Tourneux credits the shopgirl, are not a privilege, nor yet a luxury, but the only-kind-you-can-buy necessities. Why censure even the foolish for such so-called extravagances? The statement made by Miss Le Tourneux: "The necessities of life have not increased in price in proportion to the working-man's increase in wage," is open to dispute with the grand chorus of opposition strong on the side of the honest, well-meaning working-men, those common people, who form, as Mr. West says, "the backbone of the nation."

The extravagance that Miss Le Tourneux denounces, and justly, are the extravagances which lead the workman away "from the content-radiating glow of his own fireside, etc." These are the extravagances of the foolish; these should be most energetically condemned, but should all the "common people," many of whom, like myself, find it hard with present-day wages and present-day food values to keep six pairs of ambitious little feet in shoes and stockings, be classified under such an uncomplimentary, all-embracing characterization? Should we all be accused of rivaling, morally, the "screaming whistles" which many hard-pressed "common people" would give their last cent to have silenced? But possibly, by some, even such expenditure might be considered extravagance!

Springfield, Ill.

LEO F. LORENS.

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

SATURDAY, APRIL 10, 1920

Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

Published weekly by The America Press, New York.
President, RICHARD H. TIERNEY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSSEIN;
Treasurer, CHARLES J. DEANE.

SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00
Canada, \$4.50 Europe, \$5.00

Address:

THE AMERICA PRESS, 173 East 83d Street, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.

CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

The Spirit of Christian Revenge

IT is an excellent practice not to let the left hand know what the busy right has done, is doing, or intends to do. But Our Blessed Lord merely meant that we ought not to advertise our good works to be praised by men. He wishes us to do every good work from a supernatural motive, out of love of God, and to rest content that He alone knows. Surely He did not mean His words to justify indiscriminate giving, or any giving that is not conducted prudently and according to good order.

This may serve to introduce a request which otherwise would seem ungracious. The appeal made some weeks ago in these pages, for the starving children of Austria and Germany has been generously answered by the readers of AMERICA. May God bless them! But with a modesty equal to their generosity, some of the givers prefer to be totally unknown, and since all donations should be acknowledged, it is requested that hereafter the name and address be sent in each case. In some instances the name was appended, but the address was omitted; letters containing currency were signed with initials only, and occasionally a lonely dollar bill has been extricated from an envelope on which the post-mark was wholly illegible. No names will be published; the sole reason why name and address are asked is that the contribution may be acknowledged.

Generous as have been the contributions for these afflicted little brothers and sisters of Christ, they by no means meet the appalling need. Scarcely any charity should appeal more strongly to fathers and mothers, to all who remember their own happy childhood, to Catholic men and women who in the spirit of Our Saviour reverence and love all children. Even if they are the children of our former enemies, Christians can know no nobler revenge than to do good to those who have ill-used them. But these innocent babes are not our enemies, and never were. No one can hate a child. No one whose heart is human can turn away from the cry of a suffering child. These children ask you for bread, for clothes to cover their emaciated little bodies, for shelter. Will you not

give them what they ask? Could you shut your door against the Christ-Child? They represent Him, and whatever you do for them, He will take as done for Himself, and remember it on that last great day when we poor sinners stand before the bar of judgment. May God inspire every reader of AMERICA to give and to give generously. Whatever we give to Christ's afflicted little ones is not lost. He will repay with usury in the golden coin of the Kingdom of God.

A National Divorce Law

AFTER some years of quiescence, the proposal to establish a national uniform divorce law is again brought forward. Dr. Manning and those who think with him deserve all praise for the cogent manner in which they have presented to the public the fearful evil which in this country threatens to replace honorable marriage by successive polygamy. These good men and women realize that the stability of the social order depends upon the stability of the home. They see that while in some States the legal requirements for divorce are fairly exacting, in others a severance can be obtained almost for the asking. And Dr. Manning is quite within bounds when he says that the present system produces collusion, fraud, perjury, and an immorality that daily becomes a graver menace to public decency.

Every Catholic will heartily sympathize with any force which proposes to make marriage more stable, even though he recognizes that the State has no warrant to interfere in such a matter. But is a national divorce law feasible? In the first place, there is no warrant for a Federal divorce statute in the Constitution. The power *legally* to regulate marriage, and to provide for solution of the matrimonial bond, was never conferred upon the Federal Government. It does not belong to the Federal Government by "necessary implication." Therefore the Federal Government has no constitutional warrant to establish a law of this nature. That power belongs to the respective States exclusively, and can be taken from them only by a constitutional amendment. Further, it does not seem wise to deprive the States of power over an institution so intimately affecting the rights of the individual and of the family. The framers of the Constitution reserved all power over the schools of the States to the respective States because, in their judgment, the citizens of the respective States should have exclusive right over an institution so closely touching their interests. The same wise reason counsels restriction of legal power over the matrimonial contract to the States. A uniform national divorce law might, however, be secured indirectly. The method would be to secure passage by the legislatures of the several States of the same or similar divorce laws. It is true that this could be accomplished only after a long campaign of education. Some States are exceedingly lax, and would need much encouragement before they would voluntarily assume a higher moral level. On

the other hand, what is to be the standard? Is South Carolina to be forced from her position of granting divorce for no cause whatever?

In any case, the immorality of divorce can never be destroyed by law, Federal or State, for the simple reason that law cannot do away with the evils which lead to divorce. Our only hope is in education and religious training. Would it be ungracious to suggest that the very Church in which Dr. Manning is a distinguished minister, maintains no high standard of morality in this respect? It is easy to fling the charge that the Catholic Church has her easy substitutes for divorce, but impossible to change the fling into a proof. The whole world knows that the Catholic Church alone stands as an impregnable bulwark against this dreadful evil, and the Catholic Church alone adopts the surest remedy against it. Establish a system of religious schools, put Jesus Christ in the heart of the child, teach in season and out of season the virtues which alone make true homes possible, proclaim without respect of rich or poor that marriage after divorce is brazen adultery, and you may hope to inaugurate a decreasing divorce-rate. But to find in a Federal law an adequate protection against the flaunting immorality of divorce, is to adopt the tactics of the simple man who hoped to tame the Hyrcanian tiger by crooning in his vibrant ear the soothing melodies of Brady and Tate.

Making Goldmans and Berkman

“**U**NADULTERATED bunk,” that is Fair Price Commissioner McClain’s pithy summary of the value attached by him to the claim that the excessive prices in the sale of clothes are due to the supposed natural law of supply and demand. Investigation by the special agent’s of the Department of Justice, he said, addressing the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, had disclosed a plundering of the public in comparison with which train robbery is no less respectable, but far less profitable. Men’s overcoats, he stated, were selling in that city at prices ninety-one to 107 per cent higher than cost to the retail dealer, with ready-made clothing ninety to 107 per cent, and women’s hosiery from one hundred to 150 per cent over the original cost. Similar figures were quoted for high-grade shoes.

While such sins are laid at the door of the retail dealers, the manufacturers themselves are not growing poor, if we may judge from the statement of Mr. Capper in the Senate that the profits of the American Woolen Company on an invested capital of \$22,000,000 was \$2,778,000 in 1914, \$5,100,295 in 1915, \$8,210,761 in 1916, \$15,664,985 in 1917 and \$12,324,084 in 1918 after the Federal taxes had been deducted. In fine, for the wool that went into a suit of clothes which cost the consumer \$100, the wool grower received \$7.37. Such, at least, is the testimony of the Wool Growers’ Association. The price paid

for the finished garment would thus have been twelve times that paid for the raw material.

While quoting these figures for clothing we have fresh in mind the published statements that the New York Sheffield Farms company, which recently called on the farmers to lessen milk production, made a profit for 1918 of fifty-one and one half per cent, or three times as great as in 1917.

We are likely to remember also Senator Gronna’s computation that the war has given us in round numbers, 23,000 millionaires. These figures cannot be exact, for owing to the modesty of these gentlemen it is not easy to ascertain their true number, but we do know that incomes of \$1,000,000 or more for 1919 were reported in the Chicago district alone by 731 individuals or corporations. One single corporation paid \$6,000,000 as its first installment of \$24,000,000 due the Government in income tax. The consumer, of course, ultimately pays this tax, and not the company.

It is true that the workingman too is profiteering in these great and glorious days. Yet the startling wages asked in certain industries, with more startling demands held in reserve for the future, are naturally regarded as very conservative when balanced with the figures of our patriotic profiteers who would save the land from Bolshevism. It is the profiteer who has set labor the example and will continue to be the reason for universal discontent and the cause of every form of radicalism. These are ultimately the conditions, as Mr. McClain rightly says, that create ten anarchists for every Goldman and Berkman that a soviet Ark can inflict on some distant Russian port to give us a happy riddance at home. With the excessive profits, rather than with Bolshevism, should we begin our own radical work of thorough reconstruction. With the profiteer abolished we can then hope to talk reason to labor.

The Identity of Opposites

THE speaker who does not care what he says, can sometimes make a favorable impression upon an audience. But he can rarely make a favorable impression on the same audience a second time. In the interval they have had an opportunity to check up his alleged facts, and if he returns they know that the orator prefers false rhetoric to sober-hued truth. A recent number of *School Life*, a publication subsidized by the Federal Government, carries what seems to be a speech by Dr. W. C. Bagley at the Cleveland convention of the National Education Association, in defense of the Smith-Towner bill. Dr. Bagley sees many virtues in this piece of paternalism, but its preeminent excellence is that it forever divorces the schools from the grimy machinations of partisan politics.

The establishment of a Federal Department of Education can undoubtedly do more to keep education out of politics in the wrong sense and in politics in the right sense than can any other measure that the people could take.

This sounds very well, particularly since Dr. Bagley has discoursed learnedly on the distinction between the politics of the wardheeler, and the politics in which an American citizen must take part because it is his duty. But Dr. Bagley is indeed innocent, if he believes that the Smith-Towner bill, with its political Secretary of Education, its innumerable bureaus, furnishing profitable employment for clerks and satraps of the orthodox political creed, will do more to divorce the schools "from politics in the wrong sense . . . than can any other measure that the people could take." It is not quite the fashion in these days to make appointments to the Cabinet on a non-partisan basis. Lincoln, it is true, included his political opponents in his official family. But there has been only one Lincoln, and the eyes grow weary scanning the political horizon of today for another.

Enlightened cities do not choose their educators because they are Democrats or Republicans, but if the Smith-Towner bill becomes law, the Secretary of Education

will be appointed because of his affiliation with the dominant political party. Politics enters into, and is the controlling factor of, the choice of the head of the system. Probably the real reason why useless bureaus are established, and bureaus which have outlived their usefulness are retained, is wholly political. They afford a means of rewarding diligent party workers. As Dean Burris has well said, the appointment of a political Secretary of Education, the Secretary provided for in the Smith-Towner bill, will erect on a national scale the political school machinery from which for half a century the local communities have been striving to extricate themselves.

Dr. Bagley's judgment that the bill means an effective barrier between partisan politics and the schools is as grotesque as his idea that the President's Cabinet is the "council table of the nation." It was once thought that this title belonged to Congress. But Dr. Bagley, like many defenders of the Smith-Towner bill, seems to have heard of the Constitution, rather than have studied it.

Literature

MRS. HUMPHRY WARD

IT was Mr. Gladstone's review of "Robert Elsmere" that lifted the late Mrs. Humphry Ward from the position of a very careful research worker, after the German method, to that of a much-read novelist. The daughter of a man saturated with the culture of his time, and with more logic than most of the persons of culture in an era when the English people of the world, following the lead of Matthew Arnold, seemed to fancy that they had discovered "culture," she had always taken herself seriously,—quite as seriously as George Eliot did in her later days. Without the genius of George Eliot, she suffered greatly from that attachment to the thesis which made the later novels of the author of "The Mill on the Floss" such hard reading.

There is no question that Mrs. Humphry Ward knew thoroughly middle-class life in England, and when she depicts, with real enjoyment in her work and in moments of self-forgetfulness, the life of the middle classes and the upper middle classes she is amusing, interesting, and even charming. There are passages depicting local domestic ways in "Robert Elsmere" that almost redeem its heaviness. After Mr. Gladstone's notice "Robert Elsmere" became the rage. It was read with that sheep-like ignorance of its real content as "*Mare Nostrum*" and "The Cathedral" of Blasco Ibañez are read today, or, rather, were read yesterday, for three-fourths of the readers of that eminent disciple of the Spanish destructionist, Ferrer, peruse—that is the word—his dullest pages without discovering the diabolical animus that lies beneath them.

Once I had the honor of knowing a cook who had lived in a family devoted to Ethical Culture, without losing her faith or finding knowledge. I recall that, when a paper-covered edition of "Robert Elsmere" was presented to her by an enterprising grocer she said, gratefully: "I always liked thim deep books!" This was the attitude of mind with which many of the readers of "Robert Elsmere" looked on the desperate, rather futile, and hopelessly egotistical struggles of its hero. In that novel Mrs. Ward aimed to be excessively modern; it was the modern mind of the eighties she depicted, and although she remained modern to the last, she called herself a Modernist, and was sympathetic with the vagaries of Père Loisy, and never realized how very old-fashioned she was, for the modernity of today, in our society, is quite *démodé* tomorrow.

There were, however, signs of great talent, of keen observation, and that saturation of the values of English life which only a rather English woman can thoroughly depict for our delight. Neither Trollope nor Archibald Marshall, who is placidly English of the English, could give the flavor of roast beef and Yorkshire pudding to a book so thoroughly as Mrs. Humphry Ward. In spite of her modernity, she loved English society as it existed. The height of human felicity—and this is evident in nearly all her novels—was that her heroines should either marry or nearly marry a duke or an earl. Even a country squire with a prospective title might do, but no really ordinary commoner might apply! It would be very unjust to take this assertion absolutely at its face value, and to assume that Mrs. Humphry Ward was a snob. She had lived all her life on the border line of the aristocracy, and she found in the representatives of that class a better-ordered life, the fine flower of those English traditions which had matured in her country since Henry VIII had made life easy for the ruling classes by giving them a firm material foundation on the spoils of the Church, and to her hand stood a fixed and beautiful background against which she could depict certain struggles against conventionality and the existing order of political and social life.

She had fine perception, a carefully modulated, and almost plastic style; at times a great power of depicting the essential qualities of her characters, and, if she had been really spiritual, less self-conscious, more unaware of her claims as a woman of culture, she would have easily occupied the first place in the second rank of English women novelists. She was neither mystical nor was she capable of appreciating the real things of the spirit, but she had an admirable perception of the value of certain qualities of the mind, and she possessed the art of making obvious situations both interesting and convincing whenever she could forget that her self-assumed duty was to teach one or another form of philosophy. She was so well-read that she made the mistake, which might have been fatal to a writer of lesser talent, of adapting certain historical episodes to a modern atmosphere. Her use of the story of Julie de Lespinasse and of Lady Holland would have swamped any other novelist than Mrs. Humphry Ward; but both the books, founded on the circumstances which made the lives of these two women memor-

able, would have been much better if Mrs. Humphry Ward had attempted no comparison, and she would never have been accused by really intelligent persons of plagiarism. She was no more capable of understanding the peculiar sensibility of Mademoiselle de Lespinasse or the condition of society which made Lady Holland's success possible than she was,—we can imagine her in the conventional cap of a British matron, discussing her eggs and bacon,—of really comprehending the struggles of St. Augustine or Newman, or the vacillations of de Lammenais or the idealism of de Montalembert. She seemed to believe, however, that the minds of these men were as easy alphabets to her. Intellectually, she never got further than the banalities of Herbert Spencer.

The most rapid and frankly interesting of her books is "The Mating of Lydia," the most really interesting "Eleanor" and "Lady Rose's Daughter." In "Helbeck of Bannisdale," she missed a great opportunity. It bears traces of a very sane sympathy; it has touches of high talent; it shows very keen powers of observation. One may imagine what Charlotte Brontë, free from provincial prejudice and narrow bigotry, might have made of it; its method of narrative is excellent; but its forced thesis and its entire lack of spirituality makes it deplorable.

In "David Grieve," which is founded on a very usual condition of things, there are delightful passages, and fewer pages to skip than in the greater number of her other works. "Marcella" and "Sir George Tressady" are frankly tracts for the propagation of the kind of social reform, which Mrs. Humphry Ward considered philosophically Christian.

She does not seem to have understood the impetus, the logical processes of the struggles which forced her father to become a Catholic, in spite of a hundred adverse circumstances. She evidently loved him, but she seems never to have forgiven him for making his family uncomfortable in order to follow his convictions. When a little girl, she tells us, she tried to snub Dr. Newman at Oxford. He represented an element of discomfort in her life, and she seems not to have, even later, entirely disregarded this childish impression. In "Canadian Born" she made a new departure, and a very successful one, though the thesis is there as usual; and the impartial reader chuckles with delight when he sees the very refined and rather haughty French-Canadian gentleman outlined against the background of British stolidity and self-satisfaction.

We owe several debts of gratitude to Mrs. Humphry Ward; but one cannot help deeply regretting that just as she fluttered to the portal of Catholic truth, just as she caught a glimpse of the Presence behind the Sacramental Veil, her preoccupation with transitory things seemed to make her oblivious. If at times she floated like a fine butterfly about the Light, she always recoiled as if she feared that the Light might destroy her modernity.

She has been called a "Christian Socialist," but that title does not describe her at all. Her social theories are best expressed in "Marcella" and "Sir George Tressady," a novel written at the moment of her greatest success. Her thesis of English life, the essence of the teaching of all her novels, is well expressed in the closing pages of "The Mating of Lydia." The two important characters in the book have gained social position and riches, two gifts which in Mrs. Humphry Ward's mind, represented, with culture, the height of human happiness.

"Yes—the money!" said Victoria, dejectedly, "what on earth will they do with it all? Harry is so rich already."

"Do with it!" Boden turned upon her. "Grow a few ideas in your landlord garden! Turn the ground of it—enrich it—change it—try experiments! How long will this England leave the land to you landowners, unless you bring some mind to it—aye, and the best of your souls!—you, the nation's servants! Here is a great tract left desolate by one man's wickedness. Restore the waste places—build—people—teach! Heavens, what a chance!" His eyes

kindled. "And when Faversham and Lydia come back—yoke them in too. Curator—stuff! If he won't own that estate, make him govern it, and play the man. Disinterested power!—with such a wife—and such a friend! Could a man ask better of the gods? Now is your moment. Rural England turns to you, its natural leaders, to shape it afresh. Shirk—refuse—at your peril!"

Rural England was to be made philosophical England and contented England by the cultivated landlord; urban England to be regenerated by social settlements—with the mystery of Christ and His leavening of Life left out! This was all.

MAURICE FRANCIS EGAN.

ST. PAUL'S, LONDON

"Si quaeris monumentum, circumspice."

I looked around and saw a monument
Indeed; vast space, stout walls, and upward sped
The bounding curves of dome rebellious spread
As rival to the sky. But nothing blent
With prayer; just dreary calculation spent
In heaped-up stone. No Christ, the corner's head,
Nor Cross was there whereon for love He bled;
No Thabor with sweet shade of sheltering tent.

A monument in truth I saw to Wren
And Wellington, and pirates of the wave
And shore; but gracious Mary, Saints or Roods
Were none to grace the chill from graceless men
On paltry thrones; within the barren nave
No soul of sanctity immortal broods.

M. J. RIORDAN.

REVIEWS

Westminster Cathedral and Its Architect. By WINEFRIDE DE L'HOPITAL. With an Introduction by Professor W. R. LETHABY, F. R. I. B. A. With 160 Illustrations. In Two Volumes. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co. \$12.00.

All those who are interested in the revival of genuine Catholic art will welcome these two fine volumes from the pen of the daughter of John Francis Bentley, the architect of Westminster Cathedral. Not only is the work one of love, but a contribution to the history of modern Catholic art and an interesting study of the structural beauties of a noble monument. Too little has so far been known of the architect, thanks to whose genius the unrealized dream of Wiseman and Manning for a new Westminster in the heart of London finally took shape under their successor, Cardinal Vaughan. Mrs. De L'Hopital has admirably filled the gap, and shown us that the artist was in every way worthy of the work which he designed. Born at Doncaster in 1839, John Bentley from his earlier years had but one love, the great art to which through his whole life he dedicated himself with a sincerity and whole-souled completeness that remind us of the great craftsmen of the Middle Ages. He was received into the Church by Cardinal Wiseman in 1862, and died in 1902. Over the remains of his friend and the designer of his cathedral, Cardinal Vaughan pronounced a brief eulogy which sums up the splendid character of this Catholic artist. According to his panegyrist, Bentley was a poet, who deeply felt the beauty, the harmony and the meaning of his artistic creations. He had no love of money, and was absolutely devoid of sordid ambition. He was original and had an infinite capacity for taking pains. The Cardinal added that his reverence for Our Lord, His Blessed Mother and the Saints pervaded everything he did for the Church. In his own family circle, among his numerous children, Bentley was a model Catholic, and it was in the simple devotion and faith, the genuine Catholic atmosphere of his home, that he found his noblest conceptions.

These are embodied in their highest form in Westminster Cathedral which such an authority as Mr. Norman Shaw admits to be "the finest church built for centuries". Another authority,

Mr. Lethaby, in the short preface to Mrs. De L'Hopital's volumes, speaking of the cathedral, praises "the masterly structure and sincerity of the whole work" and calls it "a building nobly planned, carefully balanced, and soundly constructed—serious, serene and really modern." In it Bentley displayed a taste and learning "exquisite and astonishing" but never pedantic. An ardent admirer of the Gothic, Bentley was induced by the solid reasons proposed by Cardinal Vaughan to adapt the Byzantine style for the contemplated work. The splendid results have thoroughly vindicated the wisdom of the prelate and the artist. The volumes of his daughter's history of her father, and his masterpiece while burdened with irrelevant details and in a few instances incorrect in statement, are full of interesting matter and give an authoritative account from every angle of the history of the basilica. Architects, church-builders and decorators will find in these pages admirable suggestions for their work. The numerous illustrations are clean-cut and artistic. J. C. R.

Jacopone da Todi, Poet and Mystic—1228-1306. A Spiritual Biography. By EVELYN UNDERHILL. With a Selection from the Spiritual Songs, the Italian Text Translated into English Verse by Mrs. THEODORE BECK. New York, E. P. Dutton & Co. \$6.00.

Jacopone da Todi was a wealthy and distinguished jurist of Umbria who had lived riotously until the sudden death of his fair young wife occasioned his retirement from the world and so violent a change in his life that he became a Franciscan friar of the strictest observance and a mystical poet of the loftiest flights. He also mixed so disastrously in the politics of his time that he was imprisoned in a dungeon for five years by Pope Boniface VIII because he sided with the Colonna family in their revolt against the Pontiff's authority. Making the most of the biographical data regarding Jacopone that have come down to us, Miss Underhill devotes almost half of her book to an account of his career and to an appraisal of his standing as a poet and mystic. But as Miss Underhill is not a Catholic she cannot, of course, correctly understand or interpret the Church's mysticism and her book is not a safe guide for Catholics. Among the errors, for instance, into which she falls, is that the attainment of the mystic state leaves its subject free thereafter from sorrow and temptation, though we know that St. Paul who tells us of his raptures also records his subsequent crosses and trials. Other serious errors of the author are her belief that Jacopone, after practising the higher forms of prayer, no longer worshiped the Person of Christ, and became "half-Neo-platonist and half-Franciscan."

The larger half of Miss Underhill's volume is filled with the Italian text of Jacopone's *Laude* with rhymed translations of them by Mrs. Beck. Here, for instance, are some stanzas in which Jacopone shows that it is the highest wisdom to be reputed mad for the love of Christ:

No such learning can be found
In Paris, nor the world around;
In this folly to abound
Is the best philosophy.
Who by Christ is all possessed
Seems afflicted and distressed,
Yet is master of the best,
In science and theology.
Who for Christ is all distraught,
Gives his wits, men say, for naught;
—Those whom love hath never taught
Deem He erreth utterly . . .
He that worldly praise achieves
Jesus Christ his Saviour grieves,
Who Himself, between two thieves
On the Cross hung patiently.
He that seeks for shame and pain,
Shall his heart's desire attain:
All Bologna's lore were vain,
To increase his mastery.

W. D.

The Book of the Long Trail. By HENRY NEWBOLT. With a Colored Frontispiece and Thirty Other Illustrations by STANLEY L. WOOD. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., \$2.25.

Boys will like this new volume of Sir Henry Newbolt as much as they enjoyed his "Book of the Blue Sea." For now the author introduces the young reader to such intrepid explorers as John Franklin, Richard Burton, Henry Stanley, Francis Younghusband and Robert Scott and vividly describes their perilous adventures. Less familiar to most, no doubt, are the names of Robert Burke and William Wills who traversed Australia from south to north in 1861, the first white men to make the journey, though they both died of starvation on the way back. Colonel Younghusband is a good example of the fearless and resourceful Englishmen who are chiefly responsible for making the British Empire what it is today. He actually lead a small army into the forbidden city of the Grand Lama and forced the Tibetans to sign in the sacred Potala itself a treaty which was altogether to England's advantage. Stanley's relief expedition ending with the famous query "Dr. Livingstone, I presume?" will also appeal to youthful lovers of adventure as will the account of Scott's drive for the South Pole. But the author has nothing to say in condemnation of the party's readiness to commit suicide. The eight narratives in "The Long Trail" are just what a healthy-minded boy ought to find highly interesting and their lessons of courage and perseverance are just what many lads need nowadays.

W. D.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

Apropos of Major-General Maurice's honorable apology for asserting that St. Ignatius taught that the end justifies the means Father Hull discusses "Jesuit Morality Again" in the *Catholic Mind* for April 8. He reviews the various unsuccessful attempts that have been made to fasten that detestable doctrine on the sons of Loyola. The second paper is Father Lawrence J. Kenny's appeal to "Preserve All Catholic Records." He justly complains that "As yet there is no full-grown appreciation of the big truth that we must keep our records, if we would have a history," recounts what has already been done, and shows what now remains for us to do. The number closes with Cardinal Bourne's thoughts on "Catholic Optimism" and with a short paper on "Other-Worldliness" by Bishop Turner.

E. Phillips Oppenheim's "The Great Impersonation" and Henry James Forman's "Fire of Youth" (Little Brown, \$1.75 each) are recent novels that seem to be finding many readers. The first is about an Englishman and a German who look so much alike that one can pass for the other, a circumstance which has its complication when the Great War begins. Granting a hundred glaring improbabilities, the book is readable. Mr. Forman's novel describes a young reporter's adventures, which are sometimes very unsavory, first in New York and later in the war. The lack of artistry in both these "popular" books indicates that the taste of the "general reader" in this country is not at all exacting. —Max Brand's "Trailin'" (Putnam, \$1.50) is an old-fashioned dime-novel bound in boards with the love-element added. "Two-gun men" by the score "shoot up" small towns without compunction, gleefully shedding "buckets of blood." —If anyone but Gabriele D'Annunzio had written the dozen slight stories which bear the general title "Tales of My Native Town" (Doubleday, \$1.75) it is not likely that they would have been translated or published for American readers. The author seems to delight in describing the sordid side of Italian village life, stressing every disgusting detail. —In "Kathleen" (Doubleday, \$1.25) Christopher Morley has written a very amusing "long short-story" about a little group of Oxford undergraduates whose attempts to make the acquaintance of a charming "tweeny" culminate in a farcical situation that will leave the reader laughing heartily.

A new Catholic periodical has been started in England called the *Inter-University Magazine*, the first number of which lately reached us. An editorial note states that the object of the magazine is to "form a bond of union between Catholic students, both men and women, in the British universities, to afford means for dissemination of news and exchange of ideas on subjects of general interest," and the articles are to be "written by Catholics for Catholics." The contributors to the first number are such well-known names as Hilaire Belloc, Father Martindale, H. J. Hope, H. Somerville, Sir Bertram C. A. Windle, John Swinerton Phillimore and others, but the editors are eager to induce undergraduates to write who have never written for publication before. The editor of the *Inter-University Magazine* is R. H. Rastall, M. A., Christ's College, Cambridge, and there are local representatives in each of the universities. The periodical is one shilling a number and subscriptions may be placed with Miss T. Taylor, 41 Windle Street, St. Helens, Lancs.

"The Catholic Directory, Ecclesiastical Register and Almanack for the Year of Our Lord 1920" (Burns, Oates & Washbourne, Ltd., £2. 6d.), is an indispensable book of reference for those in search of information regarding the Church's work in England, Scotland and Wales. Following a map of the dioceses in Great Britain is a list of the places, clergy, churches, etc. and notices of Catholic colleges, convents and institutions. There are twenty-eight bishops and archbishops in Great Britain, and 4,528 priests, of whom 1,531 belong to Religious Orders and Congregations. The Catholic population of England, Scotland and Wales is estimated to be nearly 2,500,000, that of the British Empire, 13,305,183, and that of the entire world to be 301,960,485.—Margaret Renton has edited a useful directory and handbook of the "War Time Agencies of the Churches" (General War-Time Commission of the Churches, East 22nd street, New York). Besides the personnel of the National Catholic War Council and that of the K. C. Committee on War Activities, the staffs of some twenty non-Catholic sects are mentioned, together with their "Inter-church and Other Cooperative Agencies."

Mr. Thomas Capek has embodied a great deal of research-work in his volume on "The Czechs (Bohemians) in America, a study of Their National, Cultural, Political, Social, Economic and Religious Life" (Houghton Mifflin, \$3.00). He first describes the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth century immigrations, tells how the stock was distributed and how the newcomers maintained themselves here, and then gives an account of the progress of Catholicism, Protestantism and rationalism among his people. As was shown some weeks ago in *AMERICA*, the number of Bohemians who fall away from the Church is very alarming, Socialism and infidelity are making such inroads that at least 620 out of every 1,000 Bohemians it is estimated, now have no Church affiliations whatever. A well-organized radical press is largely responsible for this deplorable state of things, some apostate priests' anti-Catholic propaganda and Protestant proselytizing also increasing our losses. J. Sinkmajer's article on the "Bohemians of the United States" in the "Catholic Encyclopedia" should be read to supply some of Mr. Capek's omissions.

EDUCATION

An Ethiopian Smith-Towner Bill

TO a counselor at law in the city of New Orleans, Mr. James J. McLoughlin, I am indebted for the most amusing document on educational legislation that has come under my notice for many months. I have not been at any loss for amusing documents, for most men who can read and write also think they can reform our schools; but Mr. McLoughlin's find is easily the Achilles of them all. For he does nothing less than discover an Ethiopian origin for the Smith-Towner bill, tracing

it back to old Uncle William Brown, superintendent of public education in the so-called days of reconstruction. Uncle William was a colored gentleman, a scion of the race that ruled when, under the name of reconstruction, everything that Sherman's men had overlooked in the South found its way into the hands of the carpet-baggers from the North. Not much was left in Louisiana after that period, but happily Uncle William's lucubrations on the subject of Federalized education have escaped the general ruin, and may be found in his report for 1874.

UNCLE WILLIAM'S DIAGNOSIS.

UNCLE WILLIAM begins his plea for "A National System of Education" with the statement that "prominent educators" had long been devising ways and means "whereby the whole educable population of the Nation might be furnished with educational advantages, the administration of the system to be centralized in the General Government." With his thesis enunciated, Superintendent Brown goes on to show by pleasing platitude that education is generally necessary but particularly necessary in a republic, and that education makes labor more efficient, and nations more opulent. Hence, a system which promises "to educate all the children of the nation . . . should receive the support of every intelligent mind," especially of the super-intelligent minds which then adorned the Louisiana Legislature.

But Uncle William very properly holds that we have had many promises from American systems, with precious little fulfillment. The nearest approach had been achieved, he thought, by the Department of Education of the Freedman's Bureau! As Uncle William was addressing himself to the still wholly unreconstructed and abominably misrepresented citizens of the imperial State of Louisiana, it may be admitted at once that this eulogy bespeaks his courage, or his simplicity, rather than his prudence. He seems dimly aware, it is true, that his words are not picked in accordance with the advice given by Quintilian (or is it Tully?) to the aspiring orator; they may render the audience attentive, too much so, but by no means docile, and least of all, benevolent. Hence, he adds:

I am aware that the old leaven of prejudice because of race, etc. [that "etc." sums up in three letters and a period whole volumes of ethnology!] has not entirely disappeared, and that in some circles which are growing "beautifully less" every year, it is deemed an evidence of superiority of judgment to belittle the Negro and those agencies at work to aid him, and that the Freedman's Bureau, established and maintained by the General Government has and is receiving a large measure of opprobrium from the class named, and because of this its beneficiaries should lose no opportunity to gratefully acknowledge the good received, for, in so doing, they effectually rebuke those that attempt to sully its record.

That is a rather long sentence, but its appeal to race-consciousness is as clear as, at the time, it was unfortunate.

UNCLE WILLIAM'S PLAN.

CLEARING the ground in this fashion, Uncle William is ready to propose that the Federal Government assume control of the local schools, adopting the procedure of the Freedman's Bureau. "Instead of calling it the Smith-Towner bill," asks Mr. McLoughlin, "why should we not call it the William Brown bill?" And there is reason for the query; for Superintendent Brown, in planning his scheme on the methods used in handling the lately emancipated slaves, forecast with fair accuracy the main features and the ultimate outcome of the Smith-Towner bill. "Justice should be done," protests Mr. McLoughlin, "and the crown of laurel be removed from the brows of Messrs. Smith and Towner, and placed where it belongs, on the woolly pate of the last Negro superintendent of public education of the reconstruction era."

The striking similarity between the two plans may be seen from the following recommendations urged by Superintendent Brown.

The Freedman's Bureau has done more to foster the hope, and demonstrate the feasibility of a national system of education for this country, than all the essays that have ever been written or speeches that have been made on the subject. A national system of education, with a base of organization like the following, can but prove acceptable to most of the friends of education, viz:

1. A National Board of Education, composed of seven or more officers to be appointed by the Cabinet. Term of service, life or good behavior.
2. State Boards of Education, composed of seven or more officers, to be appointed by the National Board. Term of service, life or good behavior.
3. County, city and town superintendents and treasurers to be appointed by the State Boards, and confirmed by the National Board; treasurers to give bond. Term of service, life or good behavior.
4. An *ad valorem* tax on all real estate and personal property, to be known as the National Education Fund, sufficient to maintain the system.
5. A compulsory law for all children between six and fifteen years of age.
6. Text-books to be designated by the National Board of Education for the first five years. After that time, an eclectic series of text-books, to be edited by the National Board, and published by the General Government at the expense of the school fund.
7. After the first five or more years, all new appointments of teachers to be made from the list of graduates of the schools, superintendents and treasurers from the list of teachers, vacancies in the State Boards from superintendents and treasurers; the vacancies in the National Board to be filled by the Cabinet from the State Boards.

This statement covers the essential ground of the Smith-Towner bill. The philosophy of the two is identical. The two projects differ in this, that Brown was more honest than many supporters of the Smith-Towner bill, in stating plainly that the educational problem of the country required Federal control of the schools.

DOES THE CONSTITUTION "COUNT"?

OF course, in the reconstruction days the Constitution meant nothing to the carpet-baggers in the South. It does not seem to mean much more than nothing nearly fifty years later to various educational carpet-baggers in the North. "What's the Constitution between friends?" is a question attributed to a Tammany chieftain, and the question embodies the attitude of the Smith-Townerites. Thomas Jefferson, no mean authority on the Constitution, thought an Amendment necessary before the Federal Government could apply public funds for the founding and maintenance not of a State, but of a Federal university. During the period embracing the first fifty years of the Republic, a periodical which saw the very framers of the Constitution and was acquainted with their traditions, all attempts to use public monies for the furtherance of local educational systems were forthwith suppressed. The modern Smith-Townerites waive the Constitutional objection as immaterial, and the nearest approach to an answer which they have attempted amounts to a statement that the Constitution has been infringed in this respect on one or two former occasions. The answer is a splendid reason not why the Constitution should be further infringed, but why all such violations should at once be peremptorily forbidden. Because my coat has been torn is no reason why I should rend it further.

Further, the burden of proof rests upon the proponents. They must show, first, that the Federal Government has a Constitutional warrant to engage in, and ultimately control, education within the States. They must show, secondly, that Federal intervention, involving the schools inextricably with partisan politics, will actually solve the educational problems which the

States are now facing. They have offered proof for neither of these propositions. The first they have dodged, and the second they have assumed.

So much for theory. Now for practice. The propaganda in favor of the bill has lately assumed unwonted activity. Have you sent your protest against the Smith-Towner bill, and any and all schemes to place the Federal Government in charge of the local schools, to your Senators and to your representative in the lower house? Every vote counts.

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

SOCIOLOGY

Moving the "Movies" Upward

FROM every indication, the moving-picture has come not only to stay but to flourish. To satisfy one's self of this fact, it is enough to stroll through some congested district after working-hours, and see the long lines moving up to the wicket to obtain the magic key that unlocks the door to a flickering world of tragedy, romance and comedy. When the observer remembers that this interest has been manifested for some years, that the production of the moving-picture is already one of the country's greatest industries, and that the business shows a marked tendency to increase, it is clear that the moving-picture is a strong power for good or evil in the lives of millions, especially the young. The pleasure these pictures promise attracts all ages. Mary and Robert will laugh even unto boisterousness, at the antics of some clown, high-priced, and usually crude if not actually coarse, but often undeniably amusing. Their older brothers and sisters are entranced by productions which are a mixture in equal parts of violent action, bewildering raiment and sugary sentiment, while their matured and less effusive parents will occasionally find an hour or two of unalloyed pleasure in the drama picturing such actors as Faversham and the two Barrymores. On the grandchild, just able to walk, on grandmother, barely able to negotiate the distance from the foyer to the car, and on the generation in between, the "movies" exert their magic. So deeply have the screen productions taken root, that the legitimate stage with all its finery and *finesse* seems nearing a decline.

WHAT SHALL WE DO?

FACTS and figures need not be cited here to substantiate the assertion that the "movies" are doing great harm to young and old, through their sentimental settings and doubtful situations. True, all productions are not of this destructive nature, but certainly far too many are of that character. We have some good productions, good morally and good artistically, but their number is relatively small. We are grateful for these, and only wish that they were in the vast majority and not in the minority, which is their present status.

Something must be done; that is evident. But what? Would it be expedient to employ our efforts in exterminating the "movie" entirely? Surely not, for such radical opposition would effect little or nothing. Our work should be constructive, not destructive of a medium that can be used for very great good, intellectual and moral. What is chiefly required is to divert its plastic power into the proper channel, by uplifting and refining the tastes of the producer and of the patron. Undoubtedly this will require great and continuous effort for custom is resolute against change; but the effort must be made. But how? In the first place, all our film productions are based on a scenario, which may have been written by the most clean-souled man in dramatics or by the most lewd personage that brings paper and ink together. Too often it would seem that they emanate from the latter. The demoralizing scenario staged before the cameraman will not germinate a film noted for its healthy moral tone. The camera is an impressionistic machine that tells no lies;

its sensitized plate is receptive only of what is placed before it, be that good or evil. Why not, then, induce our Catholic writers to turn their efforts to this field and give us clean scenarios, which the camera will transform into clean pictures. You say that the film producer would spice any such play, according to the prevalent public taste, with liberal impropriety before bringing on the camera-man. That might be true, but not necessarily, and in either case it leads me to the basic and most potent factor in bringing about a moral revolution in the "movies", the Catholic producer.

THE PRODUCER'S PART

THE importance of the producer can hardly be overestimated.

He is the necessary cog in the picture machine; he is the man between the embryonic scenario and the finished product that is advertised with bright lights along the avenues. The ambitious writer with manuscript in hand must knock at his door as well as the *nouveau riche* proprietor of the most popular picture house in town. Clearly the producer holds a responsible position and in consequence should be a responsible person; responsible to consumer, and alive to the good and bad features of every scenario. He should feature the former and reject the latter. No one is better trained for so delicate a task than a Catholic solidly grounded in precept and practice. He would be inexorable in his demands for what is wholesome and insistent that his demands be realized. With such a man as the keystone in the "movies", the picture houses under his influence would become resorts of innocent diversion and vehicles effective of the greatest good. We have, it is true, one or two such producers but their restriction lies in the fact that their field of operation is confined chiefly and almost solely to the performances staged in parish halls. What we want, and hope to see, is the presentation of such films in the non-sectarian palaces that are operating in every section of our large cities. When this comes to pass, and we trust it will in the near future, much of the "movie" question will be answered and its difficulty solved.

Objection may be raised that this will never be effected, because the people do not want pictures stripped of the sex problem and suggestive complications. In reply, let me quote the words of Mr. George O'Dwyer, which appeared in a former issue of AMERICA:

After my ten years of experience in the business and after a constant study of moving-picture audiences, young and old, I am convinced that the manager who deliberately displays salacious films satisfies the fancies of only a negligible percentage of his audience and loses normal-minded patrons every day he shows these films. Especially is this true among the women patrons who have children, or who have been brought up in good homes.

This assertion coming from one who has had a practical experience in this field of work carries with it no ordinary value. But even supposing that the normal-minded attendance was not so greatly in preponderance but only a scant majority, the desideratum of the many would still be for moral "movies".

THE SOCIAL IMPLICATION

THE Catholic producer in satisfying this desire would be doing work worthy of an apostle in keeping from further degradation souls that have been lured from the right path and by preserving from contamination millions of clean-minded American men, women and children. The matter is of especial importance in the degree that the child is affected. It has been estimated that the daily average attendance at moving-picture theaters throughout the United States is in excess of twelve millions. Of this number, it is probably safe to say that at least three millions are children of school age. The social implications of this fact are plain. Can we allow the producer to run

"shady", suspected, and suggestive films which may come under the view of the impressionable child? Not unless we are ready to condone the social and moral ruin of the next generation.

WILLIAM S. BOWDERN, S.J.

NOTE AND COMMENT

For the Children of Jugo-Slavia

FROM the American Jugo-Slav Relief a new appeal comes to us for the children of Jugo-Slavia, embracing the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. Since the foundation of this association it has contributed \$355,000 to be distributed in the form of food and clothing to the suffering little ones by the European Children's Fund of the American Relief Administration, Mr. Hoover's organization.

On an average 200,000 children have daily been given a supplementary meal of such foods as will supply the food elements they have been lacking so many years. Milk, sugar and animal fats are still wanting in Jugo-Slavia. Although the grain harvests have been good, yet the debilitated condition of the children makes it especially impossible for them to thrive on grain foods alone.

As winter approached and the lack of clothing became more serious, we were confronted with a new problem of clothing these children also, if their lives were to be saved. A survey showed that 70,000 needed a complete outfit of shoes, stockings and woolen garments; so these were supplied. We now need, to complete our program, about \$470,000.

Slovenian and Croatian priests, in particular, will be asked to remember in their churches these children of their own native lands, but it is a charity to which Catholics in general may well contribute their share. Checks can be made payable to order of the American Jugo-Slav Relief, and mailed to the Guarantee Trust Company, 513 Fifth Avenue, New York, the depository for all these funds. "Urged on by the charity of Jesus Christ and sharing in His special love that He had for the little ones," wrote the Holy Father to Mr. Hoover, "We recommend in Our most emphatic terms the work that you are conducting for this purpose to all the citizens of America without distinction of faith or political party." The Jugo-Slav Relief is assisting this particular work within its own particular province, and it is to be hoped that the necessary \$470,000 will soon be contributed.

Two Great Laymen Honored

ADMIRAL WILLIAM SHEPHERS BENSON, chairman of the United States Shipping Board and former Chief of Naval Operations in the war, will be decorated, April 11, with the Grand Cross of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, in Baltimore Cathedral. He has quietly and successfully accomplished the most stupendous tasks in the service of his country, and is entrusted today, in the official position now occupied by him as head of the Government's merchant marine, with the care of 1,800 vessels, the safekeeping of a property estimated at more than \$3,000,000,000, and the direction of thousands of employees. Admiral Benson was born in Bibb county, Georgia, September 25, 1855. After graduation from the Naval Academy he rose steadily in his career, acted as commander of several different dreadnaughts, was made commandant of the Philadelphia Navy Yard and supervisor of the third, fourth and fifth naval districts, until his assignment to duty as chief of operations in April, 1915. He was then promoted to the rank of Rear Admiral, which was later changed to Admiral. He is as staunch a Catholic as he is a devoted patriot and a great executive and leader of men. The high honor from the Holy Father could not have been more worthily bestowed. While chronicling this distinction it affords us a special pleasure to mention at the same time the name of one of our most energetic laymen in civil life, Dr. Lawrence F.

Flick, of Philadelphia, who was chosen by the University of Notre Dame to be the recipient of the "Laetare Medal" for the present year. The *Ave Maria* thus briefly outlines his career:

Besides being an exemplary Catholic, a model citizen, and a generous benefactor of the poor and afflicted, he is distinguished as an expert in the pathology and treatment of tuberculosis and allied diseases. He is the founder of the Society for the Prevention of Tuberculosis and of the White Haven Sanatorium. As a writer, member of the American Medical Association and other societies of his profession, delegate to national and international congresses of physicians, Dr. Flick has been a prominent figure in the medical world for many years. He has also won distinction in the field of history, having contributed numerous valuable articles to the "Records" of the American Catholic Historical Society, of which for many terms he has been president.

All honor then to these two examples of practical lay activity, who have served their Master in serving their fellow-men, and have been equally devoted in their loyalty to Church and country.

A Privileged Caste for Ireland

PERHAPS the most interesting features of Mr. Lloyd George's Government of Ireland bill are two little clauses carefully tucked away in the body of this document, as the London *Tablet* points out, intended to make of Freemasonry a privileged institution in the "Isle of Saints." Thus Section 63 of the bill provides that: "Existing enactments relative to unlawful oaths, or unlawful assemblies in Ireland shall not apply to Freemasons." Just why "unlawful" oaths and assemblies should be permissible to them is indeed a mystery that might puzzle the most Machiavellian statesman, but seems to have caused no difficulty to the English framers of this wonderful clause.

Again, we read a little further on in the bill: "No Parliament in Ireland shall have power to abrogate or affect prejudicially any privilege or exemption of the Freemasons which is enjoyed either by law or custom." We may well rub our eyes and ask what are these "privileges and exemptions" which are thus enjoyed by law, and which it is now sought to perpetuate by statute. Are we dealing with some privileged caste, whose members are not to be judged by ordinary rules, and is there no such thing as equality before the law?

Is the Indian caste system to be transplanted into Ireland, with Freemasons as the inviolable Brahmins and mere Catholics as the Pariahs?

K. of C. "Bogus Fourth Degree Oath"

THE old calumnies concerning the Knights of Columbus "oath," the Jesuit "oath," and similar fabrications, will not down. The Knights have during recent weeks been obliged to open a special campaign of information to offset the latest propaganda carried on against them by a renewed circulation of the "bogus fourth degree oath." "Perhaps the best way to make clear what the obligation is which is assumed by the Knights of Columbus on entering the organization is to print it as it really is," says the New York *Evening Sun*. After subjoining the correct formula the editor adds: "If this is not a simple pledge to good Americanism and honest citizenship, what would be?" The following is the actual obligation assumed:

I swear to support the Constitution of the United States. I pledge myself, as a Catholic citizen and Knight of Columbus, to enlighten myself fully upon my duties as a citizen and to conscientiously perform such duties entirely in the interest of my country and regardless of all personal consequences. I pledge myself to do all in my power to preserve the integrity and purity of the ballot, and to promote reverence and respect for law and order. I promise to practise my religion openly and consistently, but without ostentation, and to so conduct myself in public affairs, and in the exercise of public virtue as to reflect nothing but credit upon

our Holy Church, to the end that she may flourish and our country prosper to the greater honor and glory of God.

Those who believed that Catholic sacrifices in the late war would silence the voice of calumny for at least a short space, have doubtless been sadly disillusioned by this recrudescence of bigotry, which will grow in intensity among a certain class according to the measure of public good the Church may accomplish.

"Labor's Political Banner Unfurled"

UNDER the above caption President Gompers of the American Federation of Labor outlines labor's political program in the *American Federationist*. The following is an official summary of the leading declarations and proposed remedies for present evils:

High cost of living and profiteering—Deflation of currency; prevention of hoarding and unfair price-fixing; Rochdale cooperative movements; making accessible all income-tax returns and dividend declarations to reveal excessive costs and profits; publicity of profits.

Cooperation—Many problems in production, transportation and distribution could be solved by cooperation, which presents an almost limitless field.

High cost of living and housing—The Government should build model homes and make it possible for workers to borrow money at a low rate of interest to build their own homes. Credit should be extended to voluntary non-profit-making housing and joint-tenancy associations.

High cost of living and agriculture—The private ownership of large tracts of usable land is not conducive to the best interests of a democratic people. A graduated tax should be placed upon these lands above the acreage which is cultivated by the owner. The Government should establish experimental farms, irrigate arid lands and reclaim swamp and cut-over lands.

Taxation—A progressive increase in taxes upon incomes, inheritances and land values of such a nature as to render it unprofitable to hold land without putting it to use and to supply means for paying war debts.

Public education—Subsidies by the Government where necessary to maintain public education. State colleges and universities should be developed to assure wage earners' children opportunity for the fullest possible development. The right of teachers to organize must be recognized.

Credit—Credit should be used to serve production needs and not to increase the holdings of financiers. Control over credit capital should be taken from financiers and vested in a public agency that would administer this power as a public trust in the interest of all the people.

Public utilities; railroads—Public and semi-public utilities should be owned, operated or regulated by the Government in the interest of the public.

Wharves and docks; shipping—The Government should own and operate all wharves and docks connected with public harbors which are used for commerce or transportation. The American merchant marine should be developed under Government control and seamen accorded the same rights exercised by workers in all other employments.

Water power—The water power of the nation, created by nature, must not be permitted to pass into private hands for private exploitation.

Democratic Government and the Courts—The voiding of legislation by Federal and State courts is unconstitutional and is an obstacle to self-government. Federal judges should be elected for terms not exceeding six years. Legislation should provide that where a law is voided by a court and is again re-enacted it shall be law.

Militarism—While it is the duty of a nation to defend itself, militarism represents privilege and is the tool of special interests, exploiters and despots. Large standing armies tend to militarism. A voluntary citizen soldiery, organized and controlled by democratic principles, is favored.

Organized labor is finally declared to be the bulwark against reaction and the champion of industrial democracy. The workers are proclaimed to be free citizens and not slaves, and to have the constitutional right to strike. "To reduce the necessity for strikes the cause should be found and removed." Every possible effort will be made by the A. F. of L. to promote its "non-partisan political campaign."